

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

February 9, 1977

ALL VOLUNTEER FORCE—CURRENT STATUS AND PROSPECTS (II)

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. STEIGER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I began printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an important document detailing the progress to date of the all-volunteer force. "The All-Volunteer Force—Current Status and Prospects" was prepared last December by Defense Department officials as a transition paper for the incoming Carter administration.

An important part of the document was its discussion of the current status of the active force. Many have suggested that the Volunteer Army is inferior to its draft-induced predecessor. The facts prove otherwise.

The military services use two yardsticks to measure quality of enlistees—level of education and standardized test scores. The report shows that the proportion of high school graduates has been increasing since 1974, comparing favorably to the pre-Vietnam conflict 1964 period. A study of standardized test scores shows a steady increase in enlistees with above average scores, a moderate increase in those with average scores, and, most important, a substantial decrease in enlistees with below average scores.

Chapter 3 of the transition report follows. The figures contained in its tables bear the most careful attention of all of us:

CHAPTER 3.—CURRENT STATUS OF THE ACTIVE FORCE QUANTITY

All Services were manned at or near their end strength objectives in FY 1976, FY TQ

(Transition Quarter) and the first month of FY 1977.

TABLE 1.—TOTAL ACTIVE MILITARY STRENGTHS, OFFICER AND ENLISTED MEN AND WOMEN, FISCAL YEARS 1976-77 (OCTOBER)

(Obj. in thousands)

	Fiscal year 1976		Fiscal year TQ		Fiscal year 1977 (October)	
	Obj.	Actual (per-cent)	Obj.	Actual (per-cent)	Obj.	Actual (per-cent)
Army.....	782	99+	790	99	784	99
Navy.....	525	100	532	99	531	99
Marine Corps....	196	98	196	97	192	99
Air Force.....	584	100	584	99	582	100
All services..	2,087	99+	2,102	99	2,090	99

Recruiting goals were achieved, or nearly achieved, by all Services in FY 1976, FY TQ and the first month of FY 1977.

TABLE 2.—NONPRIOR SERVICE ENLISTED ACCESSIONS MEN AND WOMEN, FISCAL YEAR 1976-77 (OCTOBER)

(Obj. in thousands)

	Fiscal year 1976		Fiscal year TQ		Fiscal year 1977 (October)	
	Obj.	Per-cent	Obj.	Per-cent	Obj.	Per-cent
Army.....	192.1	100	59.4	96	16.9	94
Navy.....	101.6	100	35.2	95	10.2	99
Marine Corps....	53.1	100	15.4	95	4.4	86
Air Force.....	73.3	101	21.0	101	6.3	103
All services..	420.1	100	131.0	97	37.8	96

Despite the overall success in meeting recruiting goals, the Services continue to have difficulties in attracting or retaining men for certain "critical skills". These skills are jobs that are hazardous or otherwise unattractive (combat arms or involuntary sea

duty) or that demand higher entry standards (electronics, etc.). In both instances current levels of compensation are not sufficient to attract enough volunteers with the desired qualifications; therefore, a bonus is required. \$171.6 million was expended in FY 1976 for enlistment and reenlistment special skill bonuses.

TABLE 3.—SPECIAL SKILL BONUSES, FISCAL YEAR 1976

Type bonus	Cases	Cost (millions)
Enlistment:		
Deferred: 1		
\$1,500 combat arms.....	928	\$1.4
\$2,500 combat arms.....	10,042	25.1
\$1,500 technical skills.....	790	1.2
\$2,500 technical skills.....	1,015	2.5
Subtotal.....	12,775	30.2
New:		
\$1,500 combat arms.....	2,229	3.3
\$2,500 combat arms.....	12,352	30.8
\$1,500 technical skills.....	1,259	1.9
\$2,500 technical skills.....	542	1.6
Subtotal.....	16,482	37.6
Total, enlistment bonuses.....	29,257	67.8
Total, reenlistment bonuses.....	(*)	103.8
Total, bonuses.....	(*)	171.6

1 Deferred enlistment, bonus reflects payment of bonus upon graduation from initial training during fiscal year 1976 for those enlisting in fiscal year 1975.

* Not available.

In addition to bonus payments, adjustments in recruiting policies with respect to special skills have recently been made. For example, recruitment for the less attractive skills, i.e. combat arms, is currently receiving additional emphasis.

The large shortfall in physicians, which was feared at the inception of the AVF, has not occurred. As of 30 September 1976, 96% of physician billets were filled. Currently, the Services rely on a combination of voluntary enlistments, and for the next several years, those still liable for duty under the draft motivated Berry plan.

TABLE 4.—DOD MEDICAL CORPS ACCESSIONS: FISCAL YEARS 1973-80

	Fiscal year—								
	1973	1974	1975	1976	TQ	1977	1978	1979	1980
Draft.....	117	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Berry plan.....	2,299	2,082	1,751	1,437	991	511	219	25	2
AFHPSP ¹	25	150	345	388	360	660	727	1,018	1,015
Volunteers.....	205	132	454	2,726	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
Other.....	779	728	497	311	157	194	128	133	93
Total.....	3,425	3,092	3,047	2,862	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)

¹ Armed Force health professions scholarship program.

² Estimate.

³ Unknown.

QUALITY

Two yardsticks used by the Services to assess quality of enlistees are level of education (whether or not the enlistee has completed high school) and standardized test scores.

The Services have attempted to attract a high proportion of volunteers who have completed high school. One reason for the emphasis on high school graduate accessions is that they exhibit fewer disciplinary problems. Trends indicate that the proportion of high school graduates have been increasing since 1974, comparing favorably to the 1964 period.

TABLE 5.—NONPRIOR SERVICE ENLISTED ACCESSIONS, MEN AND WOMEN, FISCAL YEAR 1964, 1974-TQ

(In thousands)

	Percent high school diploma graduates				
Fiscal year	Army	Navy	Marine Corps	Air Force	All services
1964 ¹	67	58	61	84	68
1974.....	50	52	50	92	61
1975.....	58	71	53	91	66
1976.....	59	76	62	89	69
TQ.....	60	77	76	87	71

¹ GED's included.

Several programs have been initiated aimed at more efficient use of physicians. Among these are the use of paraprofessional and clerical personnel to relieve doctors of non-professional details and the automation of various health care functions.

In addition, emphasis has been placed on the retention of doctors. A Variable Incentive Pay (VIP) of up to \$13,500 per year was authorized in 1974 in an attempt to assure the recruitment and retention of the necessary additional physician man-years. Recent evidence indicates that the VIP has been effective in increasing physician retention. However, the long-term situation is still uncertain concerning VIP effectiveness and future physician requirements.

Additionally, standardized test scores are used by the Services to indicate quality. These scores are obtained by the Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery (ASVAB). The test covers such areas as arithmetic reasoning, word knowledge, tool knowledge, pattern analyses, general science, etc.

On the basis of ASVAB test scores, applicants are divided into mental groups ranging from a high military aptitude (Category I) to a low military aptitude (Category V). The test (as well as tests used prior to the ASVAB) differentiates among above average (Mental Groups I & II), average (Mental group III)

and below average (Mental Groups IV). Mental Group V applicants are disqualified by law from military service. Quality has been maintained and, in some instances, has improved significantly between the 1964 to TQ period.

TABLE 6.—PERCENT SHARE OF MALE NONPRIOR SERVICE ENLISTED ACCESSIONS IDENTIFIED BY MENTAL CATEGORY, FISCAL YEAR 1964, 1974-TQ

Fiscal year	Army			Navy			Marine Corps			Air Force			All Services		
	I and II	III	IV	I and II	III	IV	I and II	III	IV	I and II	III	IV	I and II	III	IV
1964.....	38.0	54.8	7.2	41.1	48.0	10.9	37.5	53.3	9.2	49.9	45.8	4.3	42.0	50.3	7.7
1974.....	31.0	51.1	17.8	34.7	61.8	3.5	33.4	59.1	7.5	45.6	53.9	.6	34.9	54.9	10.2
1975.....	34.8	55.1	10.1	38.0	57.1	4.8	36.7	59.7	3.5	44.0	55.6	.4	37.5	56.3	6.1
1976.....	35.3	57.3	7.4	43.8	52.1	4.1	40.4	56.7	2.9	51.0	48.5	.5	40.8	54.4	4.8
TQ.....	33.5	57.6	8.9	48.5	48.5	3.0	44.6	51.5	3.9	63.9	35.8	.3	44.1	50.7	5.3

As can be seen from Table 6 above, there has been a steady increase in enlistees with above average scores, a moderate increase in those with average scores, and, of most importance, a steady decrease in enlistees with below average scores.

ATTRITION

The Services enlist a sizeable number of individuals who are separated prior to completing their enlistment obligations. These separations are costly because early separations must be replaced by new accessions. This, in turn, leads to increased accession requirements; higher recruiting, training and travel costs; reduced average experience levels; and increased unit turbulence. High

early attrition also makes it more difficult to maintain high school graduates at a satisfactory proportion of accessions and to recruit sufficient numbers of combat arms personnel.

With the advent of the AVF, there is greater latitude in discharging personnel. Tighter management of this licence may be required.

In FY 1976, approximately 80,000 individuals who had not completed one year of service were separated from the enlisted ranks. This number is about 20% of the average FY 1975-76 non-prior service accession intake. Table 7 shows attrition both during the first six-month period and during the first year for selected accession

groups beginning in 1973. Based on loss data current as of June 1976, Army and Marine Corps attrition in the first year of service is increasing while Navy and Air Force attrition is decreasing (A Navy pilot project initiated in 1976 may reveal a method to separate early those who would be discharged later, thus possibly reversing this downward first-year attrition trend.) For the latest available accession group, July-December 1975, 13.3% of DoD accessions were separated during the first six months of service. A 20% reduction in first year attrition could reduce annual accession requirements by 16,000 and a 20% reduction in total first term attrition could reduce annual accession requirements by 24,000.

TABLE 7.—ATTRITION DURING THE 1ST YEAR OF SERVICE¹

	Army		Navy		Marine Corps		Air Force	
	0 to 179 days	0 to 365 days	0 to 179 days	0 to 365 days	0 to 179 days	0 to 365 days	0 to 179 days	0 to 365 days
July to December 1973:								
Number of accessions.....	86,615		45,175		24,423		36,740	
Percent separated.....	14.6	19.9	11.1	17.3	10.2	13.7	10.6	17.8
July to December 1974:								
Number of accessions.....	103,159		58,653		30,022		37,378	
Percent separated.....	15.0	22.7	12.6	18.8	14.2	18.2	9.0	13.4
July to December 1975:								
Number of accessions.....	90,369		51,182		26,632		38,045	
Percent separated.....	17.2	(²)	8.4	(²)	17.0	(²)	7.9	(²)

¹Separations as of June 1976.

²Not available.

INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO END SPECULATION OF EXCESS LAND PURCHASED IN FEDERAL RECLAMATION PROJECTS

HON. JOHN KREBS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to be introducing a measure designed to put an end to speculation in connection with excess land purchased in Federal reclamation projects. My bill seeks to accomplish this by imposing certain restrictions on future sales of excess reclamation lands.

Under present law, an individual possessing more than 160 acres of land serviced by a Federal water project is required to pledge to divest himself of that excess acreage within a set period of time—usually 10 years. The Secretary of the Interior must approve that sale price, which is fixed on the basis of the appraised bona fide value of the land in question—separate and apart from the value added by virtue of existing or proposed reclamation project works. Un-

fortunately, however, subsequent sales of the land are not overseen by the Interior Department.

In my part of the country, an unfortunate phenomenon has been occurring. Speculators purchase excess acreage from the original owner at the approved price and soon thereafter sell that acreage at fair market value—frequently twice the previous price.

My bill would eliminate this speculative activity by mandating that the individual initially purchasing the excess tract file an affidavit with the county recorder's office after the sale price is approved by the Secretary of the Interior. The affidavit would state that water rights would not be carried over to sales occurring during the next 10 years, unless the Secretary of the Interior approved the sale price on the same basis as previously—that is, without reference to the construction or proposed construction of any reclamation project works. After the 10-year period had passed, it would be almost certain that any resale advantages would have evaporated as a result of taxes and water charges assessed.

In this manner, I hope to assure that

unreasonable gains, which are incurred at the expense of the American taxpayer who of course subsidizes these projects, would not result from the resale of excess lands. There is little doubt in all quarters that this type of reform is long overdue.

FLOODING DISASTER

HON. CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, last November, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration predicted below-normal temperatures throughout a large part of the country east of the Continental Divide. Now, as we endure the most severe winter we have seen in years and the worst natural gas shortage to date, it seems that perhaps we should have given more serious consideration to the NOAA seasonal temperature outlook.

It is not too late, however, to examine closely and act on the National Weather Service's predictions for spring flooding. The Service advises that four factors re-

lated to our hard winter may contribute to heavy flooding in Pennsylvania, West Virginia, and my own State of Ohio.

First, the water content of snow falling around the Canawha River in West Virginia reached record levels this winter. As this drains, the water level in tributaries of the Ohio River below Pittsburgh will no doubt be high.

Second, smaller rivers have frozen more completely than in the past. Ice on many is between 6 to 20 inches thick, and some West Virginia rivers have frozen solid. As these thaw, water levels will rise.

Third, frozen ground could contribute to flooding. Areas not covered by snow have frozen as deep as 3 to 4 feet. If rain falls on this frozen ground in February and March, flooding will increase. The Service predicts that if temperatures rise normally, water draining from the frozen ground will create a "bank full" condition. In other words, rivers will be just about at flood stage.

Fourth, the Weather Service warns of ice jams as frozen rivers start to thaw. These could seriously hinder the delivery of coal and other essentials to the very States that have been hardest hit by the present weather crisis.

Local National Weather Services offices are taking readings of flood conditions and issuing summaries twice a week now. At both the local and national levels, they are meeting with agencies such as the Federal Disaster Assistance Administration, the Corps of Engineers, the Geological Survey, and the Red Cross to chart plans to reduce flooding and to deal effectively with possible emergencies.

Next week these agencies will present to Congress their recommendations for dealing with flooding. I urge my colleagues in the affected areas to study their suggestions carefully and encourage local officials to utilize them. In this respect, I must commend Ohio Gov. James Rhodes, who has been working actively to ward off possible disasters associated with the predicted flooding of the Ohio River. If others take a similar approach, we may be able to save homes, property, crops, energy supplies and lives. We have been forewarned, and we now have an opportunity to minimize the effects of severe flooding. We cannot afford to let this opportunity slip by.

TRIBUTE TO JOHN ROBSON, CHAIRMAN OF THE CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, Mr. John E. Robson, Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, has submitted his resignation to President Carter, effective April 30, 1977.

In my judgment, the foremost accomplishment of Chairman Robson's tenure has been to lead the Board to a position of unanimous support for regulatory reform legislation. Chairman Robson in-

sisted that the Board not take a position hastily, but only after a thorough and searching examination of the regulatory process which the agency administers. The examination was conducted without preconceptions, and without any defensiveness over the agency's record. The results were well worth the time taken. Under Chairman Robson's leadership the Board reached a conclusion which is highly unusual, if not unprecedented, for a Government agency; that less regulation and more competitive freedom for the regulated industry would best serve the interests of the industry and the passengers and shippers it serves.

Chairman Robson's tenure has also been notable for the substantial efforts which the Board has made to administer the existing law for the benefit of the consumer. For the first time in its history the Board is now seriously considering allowing new entrants into the trunkline industry, and these new entrants are proposing to offer fares well below the level now prevailing. The Board has also allowed existing carriers to experiment with substantially reduced offpeak fares. In a related area the Board has expanded the availability of low-cost charter service, by authorizing one-stop inclusive tour charters and advance booking charters.

Chairman Robson has taken many steps to insure the integrity and openness of the Board's activities. He has maintained a public log which discloses all visitors to his office and the subjects they discuss. The Board's recent regulations under the so-called sunshine legislation go considerably farther than is legally required in opening the work of the Board to public observation.

These are only the highlights of the accomplishments which have marked Chairman Robson's tenure at the CAB. The Board has changed dramatically during his administration, and the changes promise great benefits to the traveling public.

Mr. Speaker, John Robson's expertise and dedicated service to the public will be missed by us all. Now, though, he has more time to spend with his lovely wife, Margaret, and their two sons, Matthew and Douglas.

My wife, Lee joins me in wishing John Robson and his family all the best that life has to offer in the years ahead.

A TRIBUTE TO MRS. DELMA McCOURT

HON. DOUGLAS APPLEGATE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. APPLEGATE. Mr. Speaker, it is with special pride that I take this opportunity to pay special tribute to the outstanding community service rendered by one of my constituents, Mrs. Delma McCourt, Jefferson County extension economist.

Mrs. McCourt is retiring this year after devoting her entire career toward helping to educate others and to raise their

standard of living. She has served for 23 years in Jefferson County as county extension home economist, 7 years as home economist in Brooke County, W. Va., and 4 years working with FHA in Noble and Monroe Counties. She was a member of the steering committee to organize the meals on wheels program in the Steubenville area.

She initiated the restoration and renovation with the help of the Jefferson County Home Council of Fernwood State Forest and the St. James Cemetery as an historical landmark in Jefferson County.

She has worked with low income and minority groups in Jefferson County helping to educate and raise their standard of living.

She initiated and conducted the expanded food and nutrition program in the county.

She is respected by all community organizations for her cooperation and support of their programs.

She is loved and respected by the youth in the county for her many years of working with 4-H clubs and by the homemakers for her dedicated commitment to improve their way of life.

For those who are familiar with the excellent quality of the Jefferson County Extension Service, they know the immeasurable contributions which have been made by Mrs. McCourt.

My wife, Betty, joins with me in wishing Delma and her husband, Mac, well and every happiness in the future. We will miss her, but know she will never cease her selfless assistance to others.

ST. ED'S UNIVERSITY INVOLVED IN INNOVATIVE EDUCATION

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, during the last few years, college administrators throughout the country have begun minicourses to fill the void between the traditional Christmas break and the beginning of the spring term.

Among these innovative educational institutions has been St. Edward's University in Austin, Tex., a liberal arts school with a rich history.

The Christian Science Monitor carried a story about the minisemester adventures of one group of St. Ed's students. It was written by a very fine Austin journalist, Anita Brewer:

TEXANS IN "JANUARY TERM" BREAK TRAVEL TO SCOTLAND YARD
(By Anita Brewer)

AUSTIN, TEX.—During the January term, some 70 criminal justice students from Sam Houston State University and St. Edward's University flew from Texas to England's Scotland Yard. In Texas, police carry guns; in England they do not. Why?—was the assignment.

Don Doyle of the Austin Police Department, a graduate student in criminal justice at St. Edward's University, says the Texans' interest in Commander Gideon and Inspector Roger West, of mystery story fame, was no stronger than the Britishers' interest in TV's Kojak, Marshal Dillon, and Police-woman Angie Dickinson.

During the last decade "Jan. terms," or short, intensive college-credit courses fitting into the period between Christmas and the beginning of the spring semester in colleges and universities throughout Texas have proliferated. Many of these—like the visit to Scotland Yard—involve international travel. Nearly 200 college students were on the chartered flight to London. The 130 who were not criminal justice students were mostly English majors on their way to walk where Shakespeare had walked.

Don Post, chairman of the St. Edward's University division which includes criminal justice, says the January term program was so successful he is working with Scotland Yard to set up another for late May.

"With those majoring in criminal justice, were accounting and sociology students," Mr. Post explains. "One of the great values of January term courses is that they allow students in one discipline to sample for a short time an academic interest outside their major. We believe it expands educational possibilities and choices considerably."

Officers from Scotland Yard lectured the visitors in the conference rooms at the Penta Hotel. After the lecture sessions, the American students in small groups visited Old Bailey, Scotland Yard itself, laboratories, jails, and courts. They asked questions. They read. They looked. They listened. They scanned annual reports.

They learned—learned facts, learned philosophies of law enforcement, and learned of common problems: that crime is increasing in London as in cities in the United States. According to the annual report of the Metro Police in London, the number of serious crimes in London has risen by 450 percent since 1950.

Among the "good ideas" the students brought back with them are alternatives to traditional probation and parole. In London, as a condition of probation, some offenders are required to do public service work in their spare time—up to 240 hours within a year, working in hospitals, on playgrounds, in park maintenance, painting and repairing public buildings.

Often probationers are required to live in a hostel—work outside the hostel and pay for their own room and board.

"Of course, we learned a lot," the students agree, "but more than facts, the experience was personally expanding."

THE PEACE CORPS SERVICE OF JEAN AND PHIL HOLMES

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I want to share with my colleagues the fine letter, dated January 31, which I have received from Jean and Phil Holmes of Beloit, Wis., telling me of their Peace Corps service in Peru. From 1971 to 1973, Mrs. Holmes served in a clinic for crippled children, and Mr. Holmes worked in agricultural research. I am particularly pleased to note that they began their Peace Corps service somewhat late in life, after their children had been raised.

As the original sponsor of legislation to establish the Peace Corps, I think that Mr. and Mrs. Holmes' comments are important testimony to the continued need for the Corps. The text of their letter follows:

JANUARY 31, 1977.
Congressman HENRY REUSS.

DEAR SIR: Just had opportunity to read the Peace Corps article in Oct. 3 Milwaukee Journal. I wish I could tell you all about the experience of my wife Jean and I while in Peace Corps Peru from '71 to '73, but it would take volumes.

We were right at about 50 years of age and had completed 30 years milking cows on our 300 acre dairy farm in Rock County and had raised our 3 children to 18 years or more. Since our return we have made at least 70 group presentations with slides and narrations. It was such an enlightening experience we are always eager to make such presentations.

Neither of us have a college background which was a bit of a deterrent at the outset; however, Jean has experience in doctor's offices and has passed all of the CMA (certified medical assistants) courses and examinations. She spent her time in a clinic for crippled poor children. Her work included sorting of medicines and supplies donated by U.S. church missions—all in English, which no one in the clinic could read. It was a continuing process translating and cataloging medicines and directions.

I found ever increasing work of variety. Of course there was my official assignment which was with the Ag. Research Department. I also found tremendous opportunity with private enterprises such as a large dairy company in Arequipa with their fieldmen out in the countryside which was virtually all through the Andes mountains of southern Peru. In addition I worked with farm machinery importers and retail dealers.

They have just not had the experience with farm machinery that we take for granted here in the U.S. and I might add they consulted frequently and readily accepted what I could offer.

Another type of work, I thought, was a 6 month assignment of just plain agriculture extension type work in remote valleys where the Peruvian government was apparently unable to provide extensionists. Peru is very poor compared to the U.S. and it shows up in the extent they can provide extension workers for their people.

By the end of the 2 years we were so exhausted and anxious to get home we could hardly wait to leave Peru. But now I realize that experience has affected every day of my life.

I hope you do not lose heart for the Peace Corps. I regret it is no longer accepted in Peru. Upon final retirement from our farm, I hope to return to something similar. If not to Peru, perhaps to another Peace Corps assignment. It depends on my state of health because it is a vigorous experience compared to being put on a shelf in a retirement home. But, oh, so much more rewarding.

Thank you for the Peace Corps. Please keep it alive and unadulterated. We were suspected by some of being CIA agents.

If you feel any of your colleagues might benefit from a letter of testimony in behalf of Peace Corps support I would be pleased to oblige.

Sincerely,

PHIL HOLMES.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF TADEUSZ KOSCIUSZKO

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, during the month of February, we pay trib-

ute to the memory of George Washington, who led our Nation to independence; and to Abraham Lincoln, who led our Nation to war to preserve its union from dissolution. I feel that it is appropriate that we also remember the birth of Tadeusz Kosciuszko, a "hero of two worlds."

Kosciuszko began his education as a member of the corps of cadets in Poland and later furthered his military career in Italy, France, and Prussia.

Attracted by the ideals of the American colonists in their quest for independence, this Polish-born patriot arrived in Philadelphia in 1776, and was engaged by the Philadelphia Defense Committee to assist in the fortification of the Delaware River.

Commissioned as a colonel in the Continental Army, he became associated with several major campaigns of the American Revolution. As a result of his military ingenuity, Congress granted him an appointment as a brigadier general after the Revolutionary War.

He can also be remembered for the design of military defenses at West Point, and his name has proudly been linked with the earliest beginnings of our U.S. Military Academy.

After the second partition of his native country, he returned to Poland in 1784. Kosciuszko led a national uprising which was successful in its early stages against the Russian invaders, but finally collapsed to be followed by the final partition which erased Poland from the map of Europe.

However, Kosciuszko who is rightly honored as the "hero of two worlds," helped Americans secure their independence and did his utmost in a vain effort to save Poland from extinction.

Tadeusz Kosciuszko, as a native of a foreign land, made a great donation to our American heritage for his efforts in our struggle for freedom. Let us salute his valor and determination as a champion of freedom and rights of man.

TRIBUTE TO GERALD FORD VISIT TO SAN GABRIEL MISSION

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I thank our distinguished minority leader, Mr. RHODES, for taking a special order in order that I may pay appropriate tribute to a man who served our country well, Gerald R. Ford.

The four qualities that come to my mind relating to the man Gerald Ford both as the President and as a public servant are decency, fairness, balance, and integrity. These are noble qualities that he brought to the Office of the Presidency at a time when such qualities were needed.

Many Members have already spoken of his integrity and his openness. Those worthy attributes were especially needed at the time he was sworn in as President. His most vociferous critics easily

granted him his due credit on running an open Presidency. Almost no one challenged his integrity. But I, as Representative, and many of my fellow Americans, felt that President Ford's consistent evenhandedness and sense of decency in dealing with all segments of our country were very apparent qualities to even those with whom he disagreed. Even when President Ford stood firm or took a definitive position on an issue, he always treated all people with a sense of decency. He expected his associates and subordinates to do the same. I do not think that anybody in this country can quarrel with his obvious fairness.

President Ford knew the importance of balance in Government. He long ago realized that no branch of Government should dominate the scene. Through his experience in the House and later as Presiding Officer of the Senate, he had a full recognition that the Congress held a proper and appropriate role in the affairs of our country. He knew, because he had served here for so many years, that it was important to have the balancing effect and the input of the Congress. He encouraged that balance of power and especially contributed to its importance in the affairs of Government.

He constantly encouraged Members of this House, individually and collectively, to come to the White House and be heard. He listened. Many times he came to the Capitol to listen. In that respect he did restore a sense of balance in the whole equation of Government power and decisionmaking as defined in our Constitution.

I am reminded that during the last week of the 1977 campaign, President Ford came to California and felt it was important to attend a church someplace in the San Gabriel Valley area. The President decided that the historic mission of San Gabriel, which has been such an important part of our history, not only in California, but in the whole Nation, would be the church he would attend. The President was touched by the service, its parishioners, and the symbols of history. I can remember the throngs that came out to not only say thanks to him, but to see him first hand. I can recall the tremendous response that came from all of those people, people who had stood for better than an hour outside of that church just to see their President and to hear him. He, of course, immediately went over to say hello to them and they in turn to say hello to him as he left the church. All reached out to touch him and he to greet them and return the gesture of outreach. This was not a new or unusual scene in Presidential politics, but both my wife, Vyonne, and I and many others felt that warmth and openness that so characterized the Presidency of Gerald Ford. Jerry Ford did recognize the importance of making the Presidency accessible to all people of all faiths and opinions all the time.

He remarked on that occasion how important it is for a President to make himself totally accessible to the people of this country who respect the Office of the Presidency and want to feel close to the man and the office.

I guess that is the best example I can give as to the total feeling he had for the

Office of the Presidency. Gerald Ford deeply felt that responsibility. He did that by his actions on that Sunday morning in San Gabriel, Calif.

Again I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RHODES) for giving me this chance to express in definitive words what all of us felt when Jerry Ford gave us his closing State of the Union address here in this Chamber a few weeks ago. It was a warm, deserved reception for a man who did indeed give it his all.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO ESTABLISH A SEPARATE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, today I am reintroducing legislation I sponsored in the last Congress that would establish within the Executive Department, at the Cabinet level, a separate Department of Health which would be responsible for the administration of all programs relating to health now under the jurisdiction of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Secretary of this Department of Health would be a properly qualified doctor of medicine appointed by the President, with the confirmation of the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this change is needed to assure more efficient and coordinated delivery of health services to the people of this country. In my view, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is simply too large and unwieldy to manage our Nation's health affairs, much less establish a realistic health policy for the Nation. Despite the well-meaning actions of capable individuals with the Department, HEW has outgrown its ability to coordinate and administer health programs effectively.

Since its establishment by President Eisenhower in 1953, HEW has grown into a bureaucracy of about 136,400 employees with an overall budget of more than \$128 billion, one-third of the entire Federal budget. More than 300 categorical grant programs are operated by the Department, some 40 of which are separate Federal health programs spending \$33.4 billion on medical and health-related activities.

The lack of coordination of health programs at the Federal level accompanied by increased regulatory "red-tape" has concerned me for many years. Since I first came to the Congress over 12 years ago, the situation has worsened as the scope of Federal involvement has increased. Without a doubt, HEW's cumbersome, disjointed structure leads to inefficient use of taxpayer's dollars as a result of duplication and overlap within the Department. Interagency coordination is often a hit-and-miss proposition. Many agencies have little understanding of similar programs in other bureaus, or act as if they are unaware that such programs exist. I am convinced that

health policy can be more rationally developed and that the health programs of our Nation better handled if they are placed under the jurisdiction of a single agency of manageable size and responsibility.

Of paramount concern is the fact that there is no national health policy to guide Federal health programs and expenditures. No central body or group exists within the executive branch that is responsible for developing Federal health policy and evaluating Federal performance in light of that policy.

My bill would establish a Coordination Commission, to be composed of the Secretary of Health and the Secretaries of other departments as the President may designate, whose duties would be the coordination of all Federal health programs within their respective departments to the end that wasteful and unnecessary overlapping and duplication of services and health resources are avoided.

Mr. Speaker, there is nothing new in this approach of establishing a separate Department of Health at the Cabinet level. Many distinguished colleagues—both here and in the Senate—have lent their support to such a measure in the past. In addition, many health professions organizations are also on record endorsing the principles of this approach. Some of these groups include: the American Medical Association, the American Dental Association, the American Nurses Association, the American Hospital Association, the American Public Health Association, the Association of American Medical Colleges, and the Association of State and Territorial Health Officers. By establishing a separate Department of Health, all levels of government which are concerned with effective management of health programs stand to benefit from the increased coordination of such reorganization.

Truly the time has now come to end the uncertain status of the Federal Government's role in health care. How can we legislate future health programs—such as national health insurance—if we continue to ignore the incontestable fact that health is of the greatest personal concern to each citizen in this country. The people of our Nation deserve better than the impersonal, complex redtape maze that now fetters much of the Federal stewardship of health affairs.

We can and must bring reason to the Federal role in health. Responsibility must be clearly delineated and a national health policy must be developed and coordinated by those who are knowledgeable in the health field. I believe these objectives can be best achieved by the establishment of a single, cabinet-level Department of Health. I commend this bill to you for your consideration. A summary of the bill's provisions follows:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH

This bill would create within the Executive Department, at the Cabinet level, a separate Department of Health headed by a Secretary of Health, which would administer all programs relating to health now under the jurisdiction of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Secretary of this Department of Health would have to be a doctor

of medicine, appointed by the President, with the confirmation of the Senate.

The Department would also be staffed by an Undersecretary of Health (also a doctor of medicine) and assistant secretaries (doctors of medicine or other persons with experience and background in the field of health services and health education) who would be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate.

The bill establishes a Coordination Commission, to be composed of the Secretary of Health and the Secretaries of other departments as the President may designate, whose duties would be the coordination of all Federal health programs within their respective departments to the end that wasteful and unnecessary overlapping and duplication of services and health resources are avoided.

CONSERVATIVE CAUCUS OPPOSES CONFIRMATION OF WARNKE

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, opposition to the confirmation of Mr. Paul Warnke as Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency is growing among thoughtful persons concerned over the defense of this Nation. It was notable yesterday that when Mr. Warnke testified that he did not endorse or say he would support the continuation of one single major weapons system of the United States. The inference was that all of them were "up for grabs" in any future negotiations with the Soviet Union. Therefore, I think it is particularly appropriate to place in the RECORD today, the letter of the National Director of Conservative Caucus, Mr. Howard Phillips, addressed to Chairman SPARKMAN in opposition to Mr. Warnke. The letter follows:

FEBRUARY 8, 1977.

HON. JOHN SPARKMAN,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR SPARKMAN: The Conservative Caucus is a nationwide organization of 210,000 dedicated Americans concerned that the Federal government is responsive, not to the views of the average citizen, but, instead, to organized, unrepresentative liberal influences.

The Statement of Principles of The Conservative Caucus is a fair reflection of the views of our members and, we believe, of the American people. We assert that: "The defense policy of the United States should be based on a goal of strategic and tactical supremacy on land, in the sea, in the air, and in space. Our foreign policy should have as its sole and overriding purpose safeguarding the national interest."

I speak for Governor Meldrim Thomson, National Chairman of The Conservative Caucus, and for myself, in conveying grave concern that the selection of Paul Warnke to be Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency would be inconsistent with the national interest of the United States.

As one who has placed himself on the public record as opposed to the concept of United States military superiority, and as one who proposed unilateral armament concessions by the United States, Mr. Warnke has rendered himself totally unsuitable to

serve in the position for which he has been nominated.

His views are precisely those which our Communist enemies can be expected to espouse, and precisely opposite those which most Americans believe to be in their nation's interest.

Confirmation of Mr. Warnke would jeopardize the security of our nation and the safety of every citizen. Senators who concur in this outrageous selection will have merited the opprobrium and opposition of every American who believes that officials who have sworn oaths to the Constitution owe a duty to strive for the strongest possible American defense posture.

Americans will long remember what action you and your colleagues take concerning Mr. Warnke's nomination.

Sincerely,

HOWARD PHILLIPS.

THE MAKING OF A BUREAUCRAT

HON. WILLIAM M. KETCHUM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. KETCHUM. Mr. Speaker, it will never cease to amaze me how a few short weeks in Washington can turn a perfectly sensible individual into what can only be termed the bionic bureaucrat. If my colleagues will allow me the liberty of offering a "flash-back," I will illustrate for them the metamorphosis of which I am speaking. . .

On October 6, 1973, the Subcommittee on Water and Power Resources of the House Interior Committee held hearings in Burley, Idaho regarding the replacement of the American Falls Dam. I was a member of that subcommittee at the time, and I was present during the hearings.

I remember very clearly that a particularly powerful statement was delivered by then Gov. Cecil Andrus on behalf of the people of Idaho. I am sure we are all aware that Mr. Andrus is now the Secretary of Interior. At any rate, Governor Andrus—then Governor Andrus—submitted a prepared statement now printed permanently in the record. In part, it read as follows and I am quoting directly from the text:

Although we seek Congressional approval to rebuild a major dam on the Snake River, we do not ask for millions of federal tax dollars to do for Idaho what Idahoans can and will do for themselves. Rather, we ask for Congressional endorsement . . . which will allow spaceholders and private industry to rebuild the failing structure themselves.

As one who has long felt that the Federal Government does the best job when it leaves the States and private industry alone, I commended Mr. Andrus for his position. He responded as follows and, again, I quote from the text of those hearings:

. . . if you will just get out of our way and let us do it, we will get it done.

That was Governor Andrus, and there ends my flashback.

Secretary of the Interior Andrus, in 1977, is a horse of a different color, with all due respect. A recent article in the

Wall Street Journal reported the Secretary's endorsement of "legislation to prohibit oil companies from developing competing sources of energy such as coal, nuclear power, and solar energy."

It appears that Mr. Andrus has forgotten his previous advocacy of the abilities of individual States and private industry, and has somehow been converted into a true bureaucrat. He appears to have become a "believer" in the doctrine that only the Federal Government can protect business and industry from their own actions. I disagree, and I am sorely disappointed in the change.

I submit the following view to my colleagues: it makes about as much sense to prohibit oil companies from developing other sources of energy during an energy crisis as it does to prohibit farmers from growing spinach when the price of tomatoes is no good. If such logic were applied to all forms of enterprise, where in the name of God would we be?

I imagine that former Governor Andrus' onetime constituency must be asking just about the same question.

NATIONAL FUTURE HOMEMAKERS OF AMERICA WEEK

HON. BO GINN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. GINN. Mr. Speaker, the week of February 6 through February 12 has been designated National Future Homemakers of America Week, and I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to this outstanding organization. This year, the theme of FHA Week is "Building the Skills of America," a theme that recognizes the multiple roles individuals play in family, community, and career life.

The test of quality for any organization is the caliber of its participants, and by this and any other standard the Future Homemakers of America ranks as a tremendous asset to the people of our Nation. As part of the home economics education program, FHA translates this important area of learning into tangible and directly meaningful contributions to society.

In my own State of Georgia, there are some 15,818 FHA members in 374 chapters, and the impact of their work is felt in all of our counties. The girls who belong to this organization are proud of the fact that through it they work to bridge the distance between the classroom, the home, and the community.

For my own part, I would like to note that we can see the future of America mirrored in the faces of the young people of today, and I believe that reflection is a bright and promising one. Through organizations such as the FHA, the ability and enthusiasm of our youth is translated into action. I am proud that the FHA is a central part of my congressional district and my State and Nation.

**"AMERICA'S NEW EXPATRIATES" BY
HOWARD A. DENEMARK**

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, Howard A. Denemark, a student at James Madison Senior High School in Milwaukee, has been named the Wisconsin winner of the Veterans of Foreign Wars 1976-77 Voice of Democracy Broadcast Script-writing Contest. Howard was sponsored by VFW Post 8292 in Milwaukee, and competed with 1948 other Wisconsin students to prepare essays on "What America Means to Me." Next month Howard will be competing in Washington with other State-wide winners.

I want to share with my colleagues Howard's winning essay, entitled "America's New Expatriates," and the text follows:

AMERICA'S NEW EXPATRIATES

(By Howard A. Denemark)

To be born in America is to be born with every advantage. Economic, educational, social, political—America is opportunity. I have lived with American freedom for so long that it is second nature to me. I am all too accustomed to the fact that America means opportunity, and I am not unique. Perhaps we all need a reminder of how much America means to us and the world. There is no better sign of America's greatness than to examine what has happened to our modern expatriates—those who left this country in search of greater opportunity.

The time was the turbulent '60's. Radicals, protesters, and draft dodgers left the United States in search of a better way. At the forefront of this outward migration was Eldridge Cleaver. In 1968 Cleaver left, criticizing the entire American system. After living in many Communist, Socialist, and even Free World countries, Cleaver returned to the United States. He faces a prison sentence of over 70 years. He may die in prison. But Cleaver returned so that his children would grow up as Americans. Ironically, Eldridge Cleaver is indicative of an upward trend in America. When one of our nation's most violent protesters discovers the greatness of America, and when our country allows him to return, it shows that socially and politically—America is opportunity.

Today, Eldridge Cleaver calls our system, "The political democracy that . . . ordinary people of countries all over the world are longing for." Abroad, the ex-Black Panther saw that nowhere else does a political system offer so much to its people. The problem is that because freedom and opportunity belong to each of us, we begin to forget how much they mean. This brings about a new kind of expatriatism that is even more tragic. It is one that threatens each of us directly—apathy.

Today, it is easy to expatriate ourselves. When a problem faces America, many citizens feel too small to help. Rather than feeling helpless, they close out concern. They just assume that the ones who always take care of everything will do so again. I call this apathetic expatriation, "The New Expatriatism." The New Expatriates drop out of decision making. Without leaving the soil, they leave the country. They subtract themselves from America. Through apathy, rights and opportunities that were fought for in the past are willingly surrendered. But like the protests of expatriates who returned to our country from abroad, apathy too is being

defeated. A high voter turnout last November second shows that once more, concern is returning. Some apathy will always exist, but the column marked "no opinion" is shrinking steadily. The New Expatriates are returning from their self-imposed exile, only to discover that economically, educationally, socially, and politically, America is opportunity.

I am lucky. I was born in the United States and have never lived anywhere else. I know that America means opportunity. Even so, there are times when we all become a bit apathetic. When this new expatriation begins to creep up on us, let us remember the men like Eldridge Cleaver who left in search of something better—only to find that the best is what they left behind. We should also remember the New Expatriates. They help us keep our perspective and warn us against taking America for granted.

We are so accustomed to our American opportunity that we no longer fully appreciate it. A man who runs a jack hammer can only know how loud the noise is by seeing the people around him clap their hands over their ears. He is too used to the loudness—and we are too used to the greatness of opportunity. We too must look to others. By seeing the expatriates return to America, we can guard against the trap of apathy. That is the goal of the future—remaining Americans. If we succeed at this, then economically, educationally, socially, and politically, America shall always be opportunity.

THE NEW VIETNAM

HON. JOHN P. MURTHA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. MURTHA. Although all Americans are satisfied that the Vietnamese war has ended, the prediction that Vietnam would be a belligerent nation and perhaps the most active force for unrest in Indochina may be coming true according to this article which I submit for the RECORD from the January 30, 1977, Pittsburgh Press.

VIET TROOPS SEEN IN LAOS

BANGKOK.—Vietnam has sent 30,000 troops to Laos to help control the general unrest since the founding of the people's republic a year ago, travelers returning from Laos reported.

One said he was checked on a road outside Vientiane by a patrol of three soldiers in Pathet Lao uniforms, and after a friendly conversation, he realized two of them were Vietnamese.

"They were young, friendly, and didn't try to conceal their nationality. They spoke Laotian rather badly," the source added.

He said in the past few days groups of three or four Vietnamese in civilian dress have been in the Vientiane market.

Several diplomats in Bangkok have confirmed the arrival of Vietnamese troops in Laos. They said they were sent by Hanoi to reinforce the Pathet Lao civil and military administration which has reportedly been put on the defensive, particularly in the south, by a resistance movement.

Hundreds of Pathet Lao deserters reportedly have joined the rebels. They are led by former Pathet Lao Col. Boualien.

"His men are in uniform, well-armed and control the access to the two major southern cities of Savanahakett and Pakse," the sources said. They claimed that planes of the Na-

tional Laotian Company, piloted by Russians ever since the westerners were obliged to leave, have been hit by bullets several times as they approached Savanahakett.

**GEPHARDT DESIRES TO VOTE
"NAY" ON PAY RAISE**

HON. RICHARD A. GEPHARDT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, by letter dated February 8, 1977, I have joined with my fellow Members of the 95th New Members Caucus in conveying our deep concern to Chairman ROBERT N. C. NIX of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee over the proposed pay increase for Members of Congress and the procedure by which it is being handled in the House. Our letter states:

As new members of Congress, we feel a special obligation to convey to you and the members of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee our concern regarding the proposed pay raise and its relationship to the trust and confidence of the public in the integrity of the House.

Regardless of one's position on the merits of the proposed pay raise, there can be no legitimate excuse for not having a vote on this issue on the floor of the House. The public is entitled to know where we stand. To delay deliberation on the proposal until the expiration of the 30-day disapproval period would be directly counter to the commendable trend toward honesty and openness. Should such a pay raise go into effect without a vote, it would only serve to lessen public confidence in the House and in its ability to govern itself in a fair and open manner.

In addition, the pay raise issue cannot be separated from the present concern over ethics reform. The various proposals that are now being discussed, including the elimination of office accounts and slush funds along with limitations on outside income, are clearly based on the premise that once these reforms are adopted, Congress can then legitimately move to provide itself with sufficient funds with which to operate free of outside influences. Adopting a pay raise without first enacting these reforms could very well undermine the dedication and sincerity with which these reforms will later be pursued. The two are related and should be enacted at the same time.

Finally, at a time when so many American families are being forced to reduce their standard of living just to stay even with the rate of inflation, a 28% pay raise, amounting to more than \$6 million dollars a year for Members of Congress alone, is simply unjustified. While there might well be additional support for a more moderate increase, the present proposal sets a terribly inflationary example for the Nation. To the public, this is just another example of the double standard whereby Congress can talk of the desperate need for economic recovery on the one hand and on the other vote itself a healthy pay raise.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my strong opposition to the concept of an automatic cost-of-living raise for Members of Congress. The Constitution of the United States, article I, section 7, gives our distinguished body the power to originate all bills for raising

revenue to finance the needs of our Nation. Through unwise spending policies, however, we inadvertently provide for our own cost-of-living raises due to higher inflation. We reward ourselves for causing a problem, rather than solving it. By such foresight, we do indeed secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and to our posterity, but not that of the people of the United States.

In opposing a pay raise for myself and my colleagues, I do not wish to prevent a needed pay raise for the Federal judiciary or for those members of the highest levels of the executive branch of Government. We must continue to attract and retain the best qualified persons available for such offices, and we can only continue to do so if the compensation provided is adequate for their needs and competitive with their peers in the private sector or the private practice of law. I was not attracted to run for and win election to the House of Representatives on the basis of the rate of pay, but at the same time, I am and will be willing to be compensated at the pay rate in existence at the time when I did choose to run, for I knowingly did so do. Likewise, the people who voted for me in the election exhibited their intent to compensate me for representing them at the existing level of pay, not that proposed in the pending measure which we should all strongly disapprove.

In conclusion, I strongly beseech my colleagues to join in disapproving the resolution which would allow the pay raise to go into effect. I desire to vote "nay" on the pay raise, but I may never have the opportunity to do so because of our procedural rules.

TEENAGERS IDLED BY MINIMUM WAGE?

HON. BILL FRENZEL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, in today's Wall Street Journal, an excellent article by Alfred L. Malabre, Jr., explores the relationship between teenage unemployment and the minimum wage. I invite the attention of my colleagues to it, and include a portion of it, as follows:

Betty Jackson has a message for the people in Washington who want to raise the nation's minimum wage:

Drop dead.

If you suspect that Betty Jackson is a profit-greedy employer of unskilled workers who toil in some sweatshop for \$2.30 an hour—the minimum allowed by federal law—you are wrong. Plump, middle-aged, black, the mother of four ranging from 17 years of age down to 11, she employs no one. She is poor, and she herself is employed, at modest pay, as a social worker by Dade County, Fla. Her job is to try to find work for jobless teenagers in a poverty-ridden area just north of Miami.

"It would be just awful for the kids if they (the federal authorities) raise the minimum wage again," the black woman says.

"It's bad enough now, but if the floor goes up again, the kids simply won't ever get hired."

DROUGHT DISASTER WARNING AND ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1977

HON. ALVIN BALDUS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. BALDUS. Mr. Speaker, in light of the large volume of publicity given to the disastrous freezes in Florida and the damage they have done to citrus and vegetable crops there, I am sure that there are few Americans who are not aware of the seriousness of that situation. But I wonder how many Americans are really aware of the severe drought which is plaguing farmers in upper Midwest States such as South Dakota, Minnesota, Iowa, and Wisconsin.

The drought has already devastated crops in 1976. Judging by the extremely low level of water tables, the depth of ground frost—6 to 8 feet and more—caused by the bitter cold temperatures of the last few months, and the relatively low levels of accumulated snow, it appears as though the drought will continue through the 1977 crop season.

There is one important distinction between 1976 and 1977, however. This year farmers know that they can anticipate drought conditions and make their plans accordingly. In 1976, farmers were unable to make allowances for the drought in planning their operations for the year.

In light of the fact that we have available to us sophisticated methods for predicting droughts, I believe that it is inexcusable for us to not be making use of them. Had we predicted this drought over a year ago, the Government would have been able to save millions of dollars in disaster assistance by allowing farmers to plan ahead.

The operation of drought disaster programs in these States has been confusing, changeable, inequitable, and frustrating. Delays in declaring counties as eligible for disaster assistance programs have created problems of equity for many farmers. I have been working daily to try to iron out the problems involved in these programs, yet many of the problems have not been resolved and legislation may be required to accommodate changes which cannot be made administratively. One thing is certain, however. If we had known the drought was coming, a great many of the problems could have been avoided. Thus, while my primary efforts at this time are more properly directed toward straightening out existing problems, I would also like to make an effort to give us more warning on the occurrence of future droughts.

For that reason, I am today introducing legislation to set into place a mechanism for determining future drought disasters as they begin to develop. The Drought Disaster Warning and Assistance Act of 1977 would provide that mechanism.

To aid rural drought disaster and potential drought areas, the Department of Agriculture must know what is happening on the land. An inventory of rural resources and related conditions would establish a reference base from which quantitative measurements can be made to determine the extent and assess the impact of drought situations on farming, ranching, and other activities.

Field examination of statistically selected sample points would furnish the base data. These same sample points or a subset of the points would be monitored on a yearly, monthly, or "as needed" basis. If done on a continuing basis, the system would establish a needed drought disaster alert system and provide a means for measuring rural recovery. These follow-on efforts would be responsive to changing conditions that may require Federal, State, or local actions and program adjustments.

The rural drought disaster inventory and monitoring activities would be carried out by qualified USDA technicians located in every county or similar subdivision of the State. However, some information may be collected by other qualified technicians. Full use would be made of ADP, remote sensing, resource models, and other techniques that would satisfy and maintain quality standards. Plans would include examining the potential of and using cost-effective in situ data collection systems to supply specific data.

The surveys would provide information on the status and condition of: soils, crops, forests, ranges, and other rural areas, irrigated areas, rural water supplies, and soil moisture.

Monitoring would provide onsite data for: First, improving drought probability estimates; and second, determining drought damage and losses including but not limited to—excessive soil movement by wind, degrading productivity, low levels of available moisture for crop growth, lack of conservation on the land, dwindling water supplies for livestock, irrigation, and rural households, shelterbelt removal, fires on dry grassland forestland, overgrazing of dry pastures and rangeland, and advancing salinization.

Cost segments identified to implement and carry out the inventory and monitoring plan are: First, inventory and related costs; second, drought disaster prediction model costs; third, ADP costs—terminal, communications, and computer use; fourth, equipment costs; and, fifth, monitoring costs.

The program initially would be implemented in drought prone States consisting at the present time of the 10 Great Plains States and four other States adjoining the Great Plains, such as Wisconsin. The program would then be implemented in counties of other States where specific areas are prone to drought conditions.

The estimated cost of initially implementing the program would be about \$11 million the first year, \$7 million each for the second and third years, and would level off to \$5 million for each following year. This expenditure would be more than offset by diminishing Federal expenditures for disaster assistance once a drought has set in.

TIMBER SALE BIDDING POLICY

HON. MAX BAUCUS

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. Speaker, one of the major bills coming out of the 94th Congress was the National Forest Management Act of 1976. Given the importance of forests to the economic life of the western district of Montana, the provisions of this act have obviously been of great concern to my constituents.

Of particular interest to Montanans was the issue of competitive bidding. In order to gauge the reaction to these provisions of the bill, I recently contacted 415 Montana constituents who stand to be most affected by changes in bidding policy.

I would like to share with my colleagues the views of these constituents and offer some thoughts on the directions Congress should take in overseeing the implementation of this important legislation.

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that competitive bidding emerged as a major concern of the House during discussion of the National Forest Management Act of 1976. Section 14(e)(2) of the act requires "sealed bidding on all sales except where the Secretary determines otherwise by regulation." Subsequent interim regulations issued by the Forest Service on November 4, 1976, established sealed bidding as the "predominant" method of selling Federal timber.

Exceptions to this "predominant" method can occur—according to the interim regulations—in communities that meet certain criteria for classification as "dependent." In other words, oral bidding can resume in such communities.

I know that my colleagues are familiar with the criteria used in designating dependent communities, and that the regulations in question are indeed interim; they will expire with the issuance of final regulations on or before April 1.

Rather than dwell on the criteria themselves, I will offer considerations that are vital to setting a long term bidding policy. Because my district contains such extensive Forest Service holdings, and because my district depends so heavily on Federal timber for its economic life, I sincerely hope that the subcommittee can integrate these considerations into its actions with respect to long term bidding policy.

The first major consideration, obviously, is competitive bidding. Along with many of my colleagues, I took an active role in formulating and passing the National Forest Management Act, and can attest to the concern of our colleagues that timber sales be awarded on a competitive basis. In our efforts to insure competitive sales, however, we must not forget another major concern of Congress—the small business operator—and, precisely, the effects of our actions on the small business community. In the responses to my survey of concerned Montana constituents, I sensed a nearly uniform apprehension that sealed bidding for small sales could actually reduce

competition by limiting small sales prospects to large corporate operators; the negative effect would be most dramatic in communities whose small business timber purchasers have traditionally entered oral bidding in the presence of large corporate purchasers, and have won small sales because the large purchasers declined to bid the price of the sale beyond the reach of the small purchaser. In such instances, the major firms have been content to buy these marginal volumes from the small businesses after the sale was harvested. While this classification of sales might be marginal to a company like St. Regis, for example, such volumes can hardly be termed marginal to the independent business which relies on small sales to meet payrolls.

As you well know, Mr. Speaker, potential timber purchasers—both large and small—carefully calculate their economic margins in preparing their bids. Large corporations naturally enjoy more marginal leeway than do independent loggers. This does not mean, however, that large corporations are less interested in securing logs through small sales of Federal timber. Oral bidding has traditionally allowed the independent logger to get a "piece of the action" because the oral process has provided critical information to the corporate purchaser on the ultimate price of a particular volume of logs for the corporation mill, regardless of whether that price is paid to the Federal Government or to an independent logger who wins the sale.

Community relations often compel the large corporate purchaser to allow local independent loggers to win sales—as long as a later opportunity exists for the corporation to buy the harvested logs. Oral bidding gives the corporate purchaser a chance to make such determinations. Sealed bidding, however, does not. Guaranteeing a supply of logs for the corporate mill often compels the corporation to submit sealed bids for small sales that are well beyond the reach of independent loggers.

I do not mean to imply, Mr. Speaker, that independent loggers win all sales awarded through oral bidding. Neither do I intend to minimize the importance of insuring competitive sales; I am simply concerned that Federal bidding policy might result in "throwing the baby out with the bath water," that independent loggers might endure additional hardships in the face of an already tenuous market situation.

One of my constituents, Mr. Donald M. Wood, chairman of the Montana Woodland Council, remarked on the issue of collusion among potential Federal timber purchasers, and particularly on the subject of oral versus sealed bidding.

"Opinion varies greatly between all companies, large and small, as to effects of sealed bidding versus oral," Mr. Wood writes. "However, certainly nothing prevents the dishonest from getting together beforehand." Mr. Wood goes on to emphasize the importance of language in the National Forest Management Act that is aimed at ending collusion. I must add my voice to his in calling for better monitoring and reporting procedures in

order to insure that sale of federally owned timber is competitive.

Mr. Speaker, Congress has recognized the need to protect the economic stability of those areas that rely on a dependable supply of Federal timber. My district especially appreciates that recognition since approximately 43 percent of all employment and 51 percent of all income in western Montana rely, either directly or indirectly, on the wood products industry. Seventy-five percent of Montana's 23 million acres of forest is federally owned. Yet, the Forest Service found no Montana communities that are "dependent" on Federal timber according to the criteria set forth in the interim regulations, and consequently, oral bidding in Montana has ended. In my recent testimony before the Subcommittee on Forests of the House Agriculture Committee, I urged that we bear in mind that the criteria for designating dependent communities should include adequate consideration of all components related to timber industry employment, including truckers for example, and the importance of independent loggers to each community.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I must stress that I do not presume to have all the answers to the questions of oral versus sealed bidding. My intent is to offer considerations that the subcommittee will find helpful in overseeing implementation of the new act. Having participated in passing the act, I know that Congress, while stressing the need for competitive sales, did not intend to champion competition only between large corporate enterprises. I know that Congress intended to enable the independent logger and the small business to compete as well.

Mr. Speaker, we would do well to remember this in an age characterized by the ever-growing hardships of independent and small businesspeople, not just in Montana, but throughout the Nation.

TRIBUTE TO FRANK CONSIDINE

HON. HENRY J. HYDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure to announce to my colleagues that Mr. Frank Considine, president and chief executive officer of the National Can Corp., has recently been elected president of the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry. Mr. Considine has had an illustrious business career spanning the past three decades and he is uniquely well qualified to serve the association—the Nation's largest regional chamber of commerce.

Mr. Considine graduated from Loyola University of Chicago in 1943. After a tour of duty with the U.S. Navy, he became a partner in the Frank J. Hogan Talent Agency.

Mr. Considine left the entertainment business to go into packaging in 1947, when he joined the Graham Glass Co. as assistant to the president. In 1951, he

formed his own company, F. W. Considine & Co., a manufacturer's representative firm for Knox Glass, Inc.

Five years later Mr. Considine joined the Metro Glass Division of Kraftco as a vice president. In 1960, he was named president of the newly formed Great Lakes Glass Co.

He joined National Can in September of 1961 as director of sales, and was named vice president of sales within a few months. Two years later, Mr. Considine was elected senior vice president for sales and marketing. In 1966, he was named executive vice president and in 1969 he became president of National Can Corp. Mr. Considine was elected president and chief executive officer of the corporation in 1973.

In 1975, Mr. Considine was honored with the Sales and Marketing Executives Association's "Executive of the Year" award for his role in National Can's growth over the past decade. That same year, *Financial World* magazine named him one of the "Chief Executive Officers of the Year."

In addition to serving on National Can's board of directors since 1965, he also serves on the boards of Central Telephone & Utilities; the Maytag Co.; Culligan International Co.; the Can Manufacturers Institute; Keep America Beautiful, Inc.; the Easter Seals Society of Chicago; the Mental Health Association of Chicago; and Junior Achievement.

He is also an associate director of the U.S. Brewers Association; chairman of the board of trustees of the American Institute of Food Distribution; and a member of the board of trustees of Loyola University of Chicago and Barat College in Lake Forest. He is also a governing board member of the Illinois Council on Economic Education and vice chairman of the United States-Egypt Business Council.

As a personal friend of Frank's, I must add that in addition to all of the above, he is first and foremost a family man. He and his lovely wife, Nancy, reside in Winnetka, Ill., and are the parents of nine attractive and accomplished children.

I know my colleagues join me in congratulating Mr. Considine on his new post as president of the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry and wishing him a most successful tenure in office.

Last year the Baltimore Evening Sun ran an Associated Press article about Mr. Considine which is indicative of both his business acumen and his personal vitality. I take pleasure in sharing this article with my colleagues:

[From the Baltimore Sun, Sept. 21, 1976]

MORE THAN JUST MONEY

NEW YORK.—Running a billion dollar-a-year business means more than just money to Frank W. Considine.

"Your most important title is that you're a human being with certain feelings of drives and values," says the president and chief executive officer of National Can Corp., third largest can maker in the United States.

"You can weave human values into your business life every day in your dealings with people," he says. "The business community cannot be involved totally all of its time in making a profit."

Considine, 55, came to the Chicago National Can 15 years ago as general sales manager, rose to president by 1969, became chief

executive in 1973 and has made waves through espousal of two causes.

First is shutting off American jobs from illegal aliens. Second is explaining the workings of American business to youth.

"In 1957 this country had the highest birth rate we've ever had—4.3 million. Those people are now 19 and 20 and coming into the work force with impact," Considine said in an interview.

"We create 1.5 million jobs in this country a year. If we even have half the new jobs taken up by people coming here illegally, we are going to face economic, political and social problems we don't want to face."

"A key thing is that young people coming out of school have jobs," he said.

"Unless they're working, we're going to have big problems. I feel we have to take a hard look, yet with compassion, at the whole problem of too many people for the number of jobs this economy creates in order to provide work for young people."

In April 1975, National Can attacked the problem by placing on its job application forms the question: "Do you have the legal right to live and be in this country?"

People can lie, Considine said, but the question, plus signs in all 68 United States plants that the company cooperates with the federal government, tend to discourage illegal aliens.

Considine's other campaign—explaining capitalism to students—stemmed from a presentation by another company.

"Wouldn't it be a good thing for my children to hear this?" Considine said.

"I went home and talked to one of my daughters and she agreed. From that point, our company adopted a high school in our congressional district."

"Our executives talked to the students. We explained if you don't make profits you can't build plants and employ people."

"They understood that."

"Some of the students came to our annual meeting in 1975 and asked questions. It made our meeting much more interesting. We'll do it again this year," he said.

Some young people think of business executives as evil men just trying to get rich, Considine said, "but my concern goes beyond that."

"I feel our whole economic system is misunderstood and misinterpreted in the schools. There's a total lack of awareness what our economic system has done for us as a country and as individuals."

"You see where the consumer is in other countries in relation to where we are," said Considine. "There's very little comparison. Many young people have hostility to business. I don't feel you can overcome hostility unless you have dialogue."

Considine's belief in helping others while he helps the company carries over into its foreign operations as well.

National Can in 1969 had a small partner in Greece who once introduced Considine to a group of government officials.

"It's nice to visit with people for protocol," said Considine, "but I think as long as you're doing that, you might as well find out what they're thinking and what they need."

"I asked the minister of agriculture what our company could do to help his country, and he said, 'Help us improve our product quality.'"

"So we hired food technologists who worked with canners to see that food was packed under conditions that would survive export," Considine said.

As the Greek canners worked with National experts, National cans were used. Now National has five can plants in Greece and one in Cyprus to supply cans for food exports to Yugoslavia, Western Europe and Africa.

National Can makes metal, glass and plastic containers and closures, produces pet food and cans fruit.

In 1961, National Can had 20 plants, all

inside the United States. Its sales were \$114.8 million and net earnings were \$2.2 million. By 1975, the company had 68 domestic (two in Baltimore) and 13 foreign factories. Sales were \$854 million and earnings were \$18.7 million. They are expected to reach \$1 billion this year.

Considine says that while he presides over the company's growth, he hasn't neglected his duties toward his family—a wife and nine children.

He prefers, on domestic air trips, to be able to return home at night.

And he says he's shunned moving from his native Chicago, despite better-paying offers elsewhere. The move would have uprooted his family too much.

TAX REFORM ACT

HON. NEWTON I. STEERS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. STEERS. Mr. Speaker, in the past weeks, my office has been inundated with protests from constituents who face a substantial increase in their taxes, at a time when many of them are not able to face these rising expenses. This tax increase for the retired, disabled Federal employees is a result of an unfair provision of the Tax Reform Act of 1976.

Unless these laws are changed, these citizens will be forced to pay back taxes and penalties on a regulation that had a retroactive effective date for earlier than the issuance date. To make matters even worse, these people do not know if they will have to make this large lump sum payment, because they have been promised by the Congress that the inequities of the present tax law might be changed.

I remind my colleagues that April 15 is the deadline for tax payment, and I urge my colleagues to act speedily and justly on this matter.

DOCTOR: WORSE THAN WAR

HON. MARTY RUSSO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. RUSSO. Mr. Speaker, courage is a word often used and seldom defined. The occasion and the person determine its meaning and thus its forms are many.

Is it the swaggering bravado of youth, mindless of danger, but of themselves as well? Is it the force that impels a soldier forward in battle when fear grips him? Or is it the steady commitment of a friend who runs into the burning house because you are there and must be saved? And on a less dramatic level, how much courage must it take for a small child to learn to deal with those large, lurking ghosts in the room and not cry in the dark?

I am particularly struck by the quiet courage that does not demand attention for itself. It belongs to the person who approaches an awesome and frightening responsibility as matter-of-factly as others of us face a trip to the store.

We may be misled by the people who possess it, for they treat this courage as simply a part of them—like a nose or a laugh—surely nothing special to be singled out for praise. Our policemen, firemen, and doctors, for example, will often explain extraordinary actions with a mere, "It was my job."

I suspect that this is what Dr. Joseph Cari of Chicago feels about the Commonwealth Edison fire last November. Having the privilege of knowing Dr. Cari, I am aware of his humility, dedication, competence, and strength.

On November 21, Dr. Cari performed an amputation of a firefighter's leg, a firefighter who was pinned under debris on the edge of the collapsed portion of the building. The amputation was performed eight stories up and Dr. Cari had to lie over the man in order to reach across him to perform the surgery, in the dark.

It was certainly not the first emergency operation for Dr. Cari under difficult circumstances, but it was, according to him, the worst thing he had ever had to do.

As medical director of the Chicago Fire Department since 1972, Dr. Cari has worked with the Chicago Hospital Council in establishing a triage plan for emergencies. He responds to fires or other incidents as needed, such as the United Airlines crash at Midway in 1972 that killed 45 people and injured 17, and the Illinois Central Railroad accident which killed 45 people and injured 300 others in October of last year.

He brings his energy and talent to his job as director as fully as he does to the emergencies he is called to. He has, for example, created a health manual, "Delivery of Medical Care," that covers all phases of physical fitness and is the most complete manual of its kind in the fire service. In creating a more complete medical division, he has established divisions for such areas as physical fitness, obesity, alcoholism, and a counselors program.

He is a fine physician and a courageous human being. Today I know my colleagues join with me in commending him, as well as the brave firemen with whom he works, for their dedication. I also want to enter in the Record the moving story of that November evening. It is beautifully written by Dorothy Collin of the Chicago Tribune:

DOCTOR: WORSE THAN WAR

(By Dorothy Collin)

For Dr. Joseph Cari the early hours of Monday were worse than anything he'd ever been through—worse than the landings at New Guinea, worse than the south of France, worse than Normandy's bloody Omaha Beach.

Those were the hours he tried to save the life of Walter Watroba, a fireman trapped on an 18-inch ledge more than 70 feet high in the midst of smoke and flames and tons of debris.

And those were the hours when Dr. Cari finally decided to amputate Watroba's leg to free him. He performed the operation lying across the fireman's upper body with a fire department paramedic lying on top of him, handing him instruments.

He amputated the leg at the knee. And he did it without enough light to see, relying on the sensitivity that 36 years of emergency medicine gave to his fingers. He did it in two minutes.

"It was the worst thing I ever had to do," Dr. Cari said.

The doctor, who was a combat surgeon in World War II and has worked with the Chicago Fire Department for 30 years, sat in the emergency area of Mercy Hospital where Watroba had died a few hours before and told of his attempt to save the fireman's life.

Surrounded by peach-colored curtains, reporters and other doctors and nurses, Dr. Cari looked almost like a school boy cornered by teachers. A small man, he sat quietly, enduring question after question, his old black leather doctor's bag sitting by his feet.

He told how he had been called at 9:30 Sunday night at his home. "They said a man was pinned and Battalion 29 will pick you up."

He arrived at the fire at Commonwealth Edison's generating station at 1111 W. Cermak Rd., "got on the roof and assessed the problem and then apprised Commissioner [Robert] Quinn of the situation as I always do."

The situation was that Watroba was pinned by twisted steel and cement from a coal conveyor that had collapsed on top of him. On his right was a wall that fellow firemen had tied him to so he wouldn't fall left into a crevice.

"It was very noisy, debris was falling, the roof was still on fire," Dr. Cari said. "The flames were right on top of us, two feet away."

Watroba had extensive injuries—his left leg was crushed, he had internal abdominal injuries, he was suffering from smoke inhalation, and his right leg was buried.

But fire officials decided to try to remove the debris to get him out. "With all their expertise they thought they could do it," Dr. Cari said. "We didn't want to sacrifice his leg with all that knowledge and equipment available. We wanted to give him a chance to walk out on two legs."

And Watroba was a strong man, able to stand it. "If he wasn't he would have died in the first hour," Dr. Cari said.

So the doctor ordered that the fireman be given morphine "whenever he complained of pain," and Watroba's fellow firefighters worked for hours in the snow and wind to free him.

While they worked, Dr. Cari "went up and down in a snorkel," his doctor's coat replaced by a fireman's coat and his pockets stuffed with instruments and medication.

He and Watroba talked. They even joked. "He said 'Whoever would have thought I would end up here from Dearborn Street?'" Dr. Cari said.

[Watroba was assigned to Engine 13 at Dearborn and Lake streets, a unit that normally fights fires in the downtown area.]

They talked about the Bears and "their lousy game" and the weather and what the firemen were doing, "what companies were doing what and who was coming up."

"I tried to keep him as calm as possible,"

Dr. Cari said. "I assured him that with any sort of a break things would work out all right. He tried to keep up the conversation. He tried to remove his legs from the debris but it was an impossibility."

The one thing they did not talk about was Watroba's family. "No, you don't talk about the family," the doctor said.

Finally, it became evident the debris was yielding only inches at a time. And the equipment being used was beginning to crack the wall the rescuers were standing on. "If it went, it could have meant the loss of five or six other lives," Dr. Cari said.

"So I made the decision to amputate. I explained it to Walter and he answered, 'Doc, do what you have to do, but get me out.'"

"I couldn't crawl in from the left because of the crevice. I had to crawl over him, over his right side in order to do it. When I got in there, I could see his leg—there was a little light in back of it. I just felt the anatomical points of the knee."

"I could feel it with my fingers," Dr. Cari said.

But even with the help of the paramedic, Kevin Crowley, Dr. Cari said it was worse than anything he ever did on a battlefield. Usually when you pull someone out of a tank or treat them on a beachhead, you are on level ground, not up in the air where you can lose the man.

After the operation, Dr. Cari said: "Walter, you're free." The fireman said "I'll turn" and began to try to turn his body.

His rescuers got him into a litter and down a ladder, but he was already in shock by the time he was gently caught on the ground by dozens of firemen's upreached hands.

He died somewhere between the fire and Mercy Hospital about 6 a.m.

Seven hours later, after all the questions had been answered, Dr. Cari, who had been up since 5 a.m. Sunday, picked up his black bag and started on his rounds.

As chairman of the family practice department at Mercy he had a few calls to make there. But then he was going to other hospitals. He was going to visit sick firemen.

REMOVAL OF EARNINGS LIMITATIONS ON SOCIAL SECURITY RECIPIENTS

HON. J. HERBERT BURKE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of all my colleagues to an article appearing in the January 3, 1977, edition of the New York Times entitled "Social (In)security," by Richard L. Tobin. The author says that the earnings limitation imposed upon social security recipients between the ages of 65 and 72 creates not social security, but "social insecurity."

This article is of special interest to me since I have introduced legislation in the 90th, 91st, 92d, 93d, 94th, and now the 95th Congress to repeal the earnings limitation on social security so that the elderly would be able to work without being penalized.

At the present time those between the ages of 65 and 72 receiving social security benefits can earn up to \$3,000 without losing any of their benefits. But for every \$2 that is earned over that figure, a person loses \$1 in benefits. This amounts to a 50-percent tax on earnings for the elderly.

And yet, if those same persons were fortunate to have income from stocks and bonds, they could receive their full benefit without any such limitation being imposed on the amount of income they could receive.

Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that since social security benefits are related directly to the contributions made by the worker himself and his employer, it should be a matter of right that the employee should upon reaching a certain age be given those benefits for which he has labored and which he anticipates. They should be treated by the Government as any other private annuity fund that an individual can or has paid into. To deny those benefits to the elderly who desire to work—for whatever reason—is unjust and contrary to the American way of life.

Mr. Speaker, as we begin to move into America's third century, let us rethink the role of the elderly in our society. Let us remove that barrier which has for so long separated them from the rest of productive society. Let us start anew and build anew a more vibrant image of our senior citizens. If given the opportunity, they can and will play a much more vital role in the fulfillment of the American dream.

I urge my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to give a careful reading to the following article. Also, I urge each and every one of you to join with me in passing my bill—H.R. 2775—to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to permit an individual receiving benefits thereunder to earn outside income without losing any of such benefits.

The article is as follows:

SOCIAL (IN)SECURITY

(By Richard L. Tobin)

If President-elect Carter wishes to become immediately popular with almost anyone over 65, he will tackle at once, and with the greatest vigor, one of the most grossly unfair Federal laws—the one that says you cannot earn a decent living after your 65th birthday and get your well-deserved Social Security at the same time.

In 1977, the maximum a beneficiary can earn will increase to \$3,000 a year if he or she wants to collect his or her Social Security income. It's been \$2,760 a year up to now, but the magnificent \$240 rise won't do much to help those of us who have little or no pension money coming in besides our overdue Social Security benefits.

If your income derives from stock or bonds and not from a paycheck, you can collect the whole Social Security check each month. But for those of us who live from paycheck to paycheck, and whose income comes directly from the sweat of our aging brow, there is little or no chance of our beginning to collect on the Social Security benefits we've been entitled to ever since we hit 65.

Let me cite my own case, since it is typical of those—millions certainly—who are now being robbed of a chance to retire, at least in part.

I have been a dues-paying member of the Social Security system since Dec. 8, 1936, the day it began. So far as I know, my employers have never missed a payment and I know they have deducted many thousands of dollars from my paychecks over the last 40 years. Each year more has been taken out, and at present this figure runs in excess of \$875 per annum.

Yet, after exactly 40 years of paying in, I cannot begin to collect. The reason is, essentially, that I worked for The New York Herald Tribune for 24 years and the Trib had no formal pension system, though it did take care of a few ancient out-pensioners while it was still operative. But the day The Tribune folded, any chance any of its staffers might have had for even a modest pension went down the drain in the welter of bankruptcy. Had the present Federal law guaranteeing pensions been in effect at that time, we staffers might have salvaged something. But the rude fact is that we did not and must therefore, continue to work to survive.

Fortunately for me, I went to work for the Saturday Review in 1960 and was soon taken in under the pension wing of McCall's, which took over the magazine in 1961. It was a good retirement plan and would have worked beautifully had SR not been sold over Norman Cousins' head, at which point I no longer had a pension plan. Fortunately, the few years under McCall's-Norton Simon ownership meant that my pension money, small as it was, had been funded and would come

to me no matter who owned me. But it was small, quite naturally, since I was under its wing for less than ten years, starting at the age of 50.

When we recently got SR back, we were faced with all sorts of financial problems, most of which are now beginning to work out. We are probably breaking even—just. But there is little or nothing left over to give us pension money. That is not anyone's fault. In a sense we're lucky to be afloat at all, and I am luckier still to be on someone's payroll at 66.

But the cruel fact is that I cannot stop working because I cannot live on Social Security and the small pension I earned those few years in the 1960's. For every \$2 I earn above \$3,000 (starting in January) \$1 in Social Security benefit is to be taken away. Therefore, if my Social Security income (counting my wife's) is about \$6,000 per year, I can forget it if I make \$12,000 in salary. Since we cannot live even modestly on the \$6,000 plus the small McCall's pension, I am obliged to go on working. Of course, at age 72, the law says, I can keep everything I earn and get my Social Security, too. But I've told myself not to hold my breath.

The original intent of the Social Security law limiting earnings beyond 65 was to open up the employment market for Depression youngsters. That purpose has long since eroded. I like to work. I'm a writer-editor by trade and I shall always be working at something. But I'd very much like to work a bit less for someone else and live, at least in part, on some of the money I've paid in to Washington for just such a purpose over the last four decades. I think I have it coming.

If the lawmakers can't see their way to lifting the silly ceiling on earnings altogether, then maybe they'd raise it so people like me could get a bit of what's coming to them regardless of paycheck. My wife and I would like to travel a little. When I was managing editor of SR and later associate publisher, I had the money but never could scrape together the time to do Europe or Asia. I'd like to now. And it really isn't fair that, through no fault of mine, one splendid publication on which I worked for almost a quarter of a century went to the wall and any pension with it, or that someone bought out from under us at SR, even though the story has a happy ending.

So, Mr. President-elect, if you wish to become immediately popular with at least one Republican, you will recommend immediate changes in the Social Security eligibility laws and see that Congress does something about them.

HEALTH CARE LEGISLATION AND PHILANTHROPY

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, at the 10th annual conference of the National Association for Hospital Development in Houston, Tex., Theodore Cooper, M.D., former Assistant Secretary for Health of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, received the association's achievement award for 1976 for his work on behalf of the private health care system and for his outspoken support for the role of philanthropy in that system.

Philanthropy has had a long and honorable tradition in this country in the fields of education and public service

as well as in health. I am hopeful that the Congress will see its way clear to including in any national health insurance program a provision that philanthropy shall be continued and, in fact, encouraged and that the philanthropic dollar will not be the first Federal dollar provided for reimbursement.

In order that my colleagues may have the opportunity to examine Dr. Cooper's speech in depth, I include it at this point in the RECORD:

HEALTH CARE LEGISLATION AND PHILANTHROPY

(By Theodore Cooper, M.D.)

I am very grateful for the honor of having been named to receive the Association's Achievement Award for 1976. There are a great many people in this country who have made very substantial contributions to preserving private philanthropy as the keystone of the American voluntary health care system. A lot of them are in this room, and I am proud to be in your company.

The 1976 Achievement Award could rightfully go to any of you—or to all of you. But I am glad to accept this distinction because there is no one here who feels more strongly than I do that private philanthropy—for its own sake and because of what it represents in American society—is a priceless resource and one that we must never abandon, either by design or by folly.

I know quite well that there are those who believe that philanthropy has a short future in the American health system, that the certain arrival of national health insurance will mark the certain departure of voluntary giving.

Let me just say that while I understand the thinking behind that prognosis, I also understand the major and undiminished need for philanthropy in the health field. And I think I appreciate, as well as anyone does, the irreplaceable loss that the health care system would suffer if national health insurance or any other manifestation of social or economic policy brought an end to the tremendous rewards that accrue from the voluntary donation of funds and personal energy in the spirit of philanthropy.

Such a loss to the health care system might be calculated in dollars, but it would be reflected in research not carried out, services not provided, and innovations not exploited.

In short, the loss of philanthropy would hit hard at the very places where our health care system is most in need of creativity and freedom, in the places where new ideas and new approaches to old problems can lead to needed change.

And without the capacity for change, the health care system would be in grave danger.

In the last decade, we have seen enacted more health legislation of more far-reaching consequences than ever before in the 200 years of our country's existence. In the spirit of assuring to every American a right to health, we have legislated and implemented vast programs that run the gamut of the whole health enterprise—from the pursuit of basic knowledge to the provision of care for millions of people who might otherwise not have equal access to it.

I do not have to recite that parade of laws—indeed there isn't even time enough for me to do it. But I would call your attention to a subtle but vastly important change that has occurred in the form and intent of this legislation.

Broadly speaking, we have moved from legislative action whose intent was primarily to make health care more plentiful and more available, to legislation that seeks to constrain the growth and function of the health care system, to increase its productivity, eliminate unnecessary utilization, and improve the quality of care.

It is not an oversimplification to say that the driving force behind these legislative measures—in fact the driving force behind virtually every health policy decision—is rising cost. We have entered a period in the evolution of the American health care system whose most distinguishing characteristic is sharply escalating expenditures for health care—expenditures by private citizens, expenditures by the Nation's hospitals, and expenditures by government at every level.

No one can seriously quarrel with the need to contain the rising cost of health care. And neither can anyone take issue with the objectives of seeing to it that we make the best use of the resources we have, avoid waste, and strive for care of the highest quality that can be achieved.

But because I happen to agree with Thomas Jefferson who held that government exists to do for people what they cannot do for themselves, I think we all have to be acutely alert to the consequences that can follow from a too-easy assumption that government can make it all come out all right—that government can keep health care costs in line, make sure that the system has everything it needs in the right place at the right time, and that everybody who seeks health care will get the best there is.

The consequences of that kind of naive thinking can be disastrous. As you people know all too well, they can literally dry up not just the philanthropic gift, but the spirit of philanthropy itself. The closer we come to the idea that government can and should assume every responsibility of the public good, the closer we come to foreclosing any form of private voluntary initiative in the health field.

For example, as urgently as we need to make health planning an effective tool for improved efficiency and productivity, we must also guard against regulation in the service of better health planning that makes it difficult for hospitals to accept philanthropic contributions. We all understand that there are times when a private donation might lead to an inappropriate capital expenditure, and we ought to be able to prevent that. But to do it through a regulatory mechanism that cuts off private support for appropriate and necessary purposes as well is simply wrong.

We don't have to throw out the baby with the bathwater, and the way to avoid that is to be able to tell the difference.

Discussions about national health insurance tend to focus on a number of key issues—the cost, both to individuals and to the Nation, the kind of benefits to be covered, the financing scheme, controls on cost and utilization, and other critically important questions the answers to which will shape not just the insurance plan, but the entire health care system for years to come.

But there are other factors that simply must not be overlooked in the rush to devise a health insurance plan that Congress will enact, the President will sign, and the country can live with.

One of those factors, of course, is the impact of national health insurance on philanthropy, an issue that very deeply concerns both the donors and the recipients of the nearly \$4 billion that is contributed annually to the health care system.

There is some logic in the prediction that national health insurance will sharply reduce—if not in fact eliminate—philanthropy in the health field. From a purely economic point of view, the need for philanthropy might seem to disappear when a national health insurance scheme assures hospitals full reimbursement for all activities associated with patient care.

But such reasoning equates philanthropy with charity. And it fails to recognize that all great medical centers—and even many hospitals of more modest scope—are able to undertake projects and programs only be-

cause generous organizations and individuals are willing and able to provide the necessary support.

Furthermore, the kind of activities made possible through philanthropic donations and private grants are likely to represent innovations, in both research and services, for which public funds are often not available.

By and large, the public's money ought to be used to exploit proven advances in the provisions of social services—including health care—and to seek new knowledge in problem areas that have a major impact on individuals and society.

Moreover, at a time when Federal spending is under extremely tight restrictions, tax dollars have to be spent to make sure that mandated goals—like paying for health services for the elderly, the disabled, and the poor—are not being neglected.

What this means, of course, is that both national health insurance and tight Federal health budgets tend to make philanthropy an increasingly vital and important source of funds for the health care system—the kind of venture capital that can point the way to significant change.

I flew down to Houston today with John Grupehoff, a man I have known and worked with for many years who ably represents your Association in Washington, and who has a deep understanding of the issues that all of us—in both the public and the private health sectors—have to wrestle with.

One of those issues, of course, is the fact that tens of millions of Americans have either no health insurance protection whatever or are covered inadequately by plans that foster expensive and inappropriate use of the Nation's limited health resources.

We have to correct these defects. But in doing that, we have to guard against devising a system that might create new problems and make old ones worse.

To foreclose private philanthropy would be a grave mistake.

To add materially to the demand for health services without making certain that the system can respond would be a grave mistake.

And to institute an insurance system that had no effective mechanisms for cost containment and quality assurance would be a grave mistake.

I am confident that many people within and outside the Federal government are well aware of these considerations. But I am equally sure that it will take the best and most enlightened leadership of the entire health industry to design a responsible health insurance system, and once it is adopted, to make it work.

That kind of leadership has to come from the Public Health Service, and I think we are increasingly able to provide it. But it has to come from the private sector as well, from people like yourselves, from the medical profession, from the insurance industry, and from parts of American society that have up until now, shown little interest in how our health care system works and what its problems are.

We have made it too easy for the American people to think that government can fix everything. Even when government policies are wrong—and sometimes they are—the public looks to government to find solutions.

Well, believe me, government doesn't have all the answers. Laws and budgets can't make everything right. Fine pronouncements about national health goals and strategies are not worth anything unless they articulate the will and command the support of private citizens, taxpayers, private industry, and those who are able to share with others in the spirit of philanthropy.

As long as I have a voice in the leadership of the Federal health effort, I intend to be as forceful as I can in the service of preserving a viable, independent, and creative private and voluntary health enterprise for this

country. I feel sure you share that purpose, and I invite your help in making certain that neither government nor the private sector ever forgets it.

Again, I thank you for the honor of receiving your Achievement Award. I will do everything I can to merit your confidence.

COMMUNIST PARTY AND SOVIET UNION DEFEND WARNKE APPOINTMENT

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, in a February 5 editorial in its official newspaper, the Soviet-controlled Communist Party, U.S.A.—CPUSA—has declared its support for the nomination of Paul C. Warnke as Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency by slanderously lashing out at responsible critics in the Senate and private sector who point with alarm to Mr. Warnke's long-held extreme prodismament positions.

The hysterical Communist Party attack on responsible critics of risky unilateral disarmament parrot those heard nightly on Radio Moscow's broadcasts and printed in the Soviet Communist Party press.

The Soviets desperately want the United States to give up in a new round of strategic arms limitations talks—SALT—the cruise missile and the B-1 bomber. The Soviet Union will not be able to develop an effective counter to the cheap, versatile cruise missile for many years, and it does not want its new supersonic Backfire bombers to have competition from our B-1.

The Communists' arguments in support of Warnke and the policies he has long upheld should be of interest to all. I attach the text of Moscow Tass article on February 3, 1977; and of a Daily World editorial of February 5, 1977:

[Moscow Tass in English 1502 GMT 3 Feb 77 LD]

"THE 'HAWKS' TRY TO DICTATE THEIR TERMS"

[Text] Washington, February 3, TASS—President Carter has appointed Paul Warnke to the post of director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and head of the U. S. delegation at the Soviet-American Strategic Arms Limitation Talks.

Till 1969 Warnke was assistant secretary of defense for international security matters, and in American political circles has the reputation of an exponent of restricting the arms race.

Warnke's nomination is sharply opposed by circles close to the military-industrial complex. The "Hawks" in the Senate's Armed Forces Committee are hastily taking measures to foil his candidature. Especially zealous in this respect are such notorious opponents of détente as Senators Nunn and Jackson. An anonymous "memorandum" is now being circulated in the Senate accusing Warnke of allegedly wanting the United States unilaterally to discard several strategic weapons systems and stating that for this reason he cannot be sufficiently "firm" at Soviet-American Strategic Arms Limitation Talks.

It is already not the first time that reactionary forces in the United States are trying to prevent the approval of candidatures nom-

inated to high posts by the new administration. Last month, for instance, they launched a vicious campaign against Theodore Sorensen, a prominent American politician who is close to the Kennedy clan. As a result, Sorensen had to turn down the government post offered to him.

[From the Daily World, Feb. 5, 1977]

WARNKE APPOINTMENT

How many hundreds of thousands of jobs were lost by U.S. workers because of restrictions in the 1974 Trade Act can only be guessed at. But there is no guesswork about the responsibility of the Senator whose name is attached to the job-cutting amendment to that bill—Sen. Henry M. Jackson (D-Wash.).

Jackson is still serving the military-industrial complex instead of the people of his state and the USA. He, and a gang of right-wing social democrats, zionists, such anti-Sovieters as George Meany, Sen. Daniel Moynihan and other cold war hawks are on a rampage now to torpedo any possible arms reduction agreement with the Soviet Union. They place swelling the enormous profits of the military-industrial complex ahead of the U.S. people's needs.

Their immediate aim is to block confirmation of President Carter's nomination of Paul C. Warnke as head of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, on the grounds that he is "soft" on the issue. The claim is phony, a smoke-screen to hide their real objective from the U.S. people—to continue ripping off the U.S. taxpayer with ever bigger military spending, a draft military force and nuclear war threats.

The warhawks have already cost U.S. workers many jobs. They have to be stopped from putting our lives in jeopardy too. Tell your representative in Congress that you want a SALT agreement!

LESSONS TO BE LEARNED FROM THE BRITISH NHI

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, a number of physicians who have worked under the British National Health Service are now warning us to learn from their mistakes and preserve the private practice of medicine in this country rather than create a system of national health insurance. Dr. James Sutherland, a British expatriate practicing in Quincy, Ill., has presented an excellent analysis of the history and defects of the British system in an article I am inserting for the benefit of my colleagues. We have much to learn from this example.

[From the Worcester Medical News, May-June, 1976]

LOOK BEFORE YOU LEAP: LESSONS TO BE LEARNED FROM THE BRITISH NATIONAL HEALTH SERVICE

(By James W. Sutherland, M.D.)

THE HISTORY OF THE BRITISH NATIONAL HEALTH SERVICE

The idea of National Health Insurance is no novelty to the British people. In 1908, the Webbs, pioneers of the Fabian Socialist group, declared that Britain would never be healthy until it had a State Medical Service.

In 1911, Lloyd George, the first Welshman to leave his imprint on UK Medical care, introduced a type of NHI in which for a payment of approximately six to ten cents per

week, working men and their families received a limited form of coverage. This applied only to care in the doctor's office, as at that time the hospitals were under the voluntary system, indeed some were in fact Poor Law hospitals. This type of care was loosely referred to as "being on the panel". In spite of the pejorative sound, it at least afforded poorer people the right to examination and outpatient treatment of a rough type, and referral where necessary to voluntary or municipalized hospitals.

By 1919, Poor Law hospitals in Great Britain had been municipalized and standards raised. For the ordinary citizen, being in the hospital meant being in wards of up to, and sometimes exceeding, 20 beds. Private practice meant nursing home care, some of it good, conducted in houses of large size converted for that purpose.

The principal impetus toward a National Health Service arrived with the Second World War. In 1939, Great Britain had to marshal all her medical resources to face bombing and war casualties who had returned to Great Britain from overseas. This was called the Emergency Medical Service and numerous temporary hospitals were erected for this purpose.

The final catalyst was the delivery of the Beveridge Report in 1942. Sir William (later Lord) Beveridge produced a report, "Social Insurance and Allied Services". His assumption was that in any post war social insurance plan there would be "Comprehensive Health and Rehabilitation services for prevention and cure of diseases and restoration of capacity for work, available for all in the community".

With the end of World War II, the Labor, or Socialist party, came to power and its NHS (National Health Service) Act of 1946 stated that "the medical service must be planned as a whole, must be preventive as well as curative, and must be complete and open to all so that poverty shall be no bar to health".

From the outset, the main aspects of the British National Health Service were—

- It was completely comprehensive;
- It was available to everybody; and
- It was completely free.

Like many new ideas, the theory of this was attractive, but performance was inept. The architects believed that if health care were made available to all, fitness would so improve that costs would become less and less. Not taken into consideration was the fact that patients would live longer and that costs would be added to the service at the geriatric end of the scale. It should have been obvious to these economists that Britain, or any other country, did not have the men or the money to carry out these three components of a national health service. Nobody carried out an actuarial study of the possible costs. From its onset, the NHS was badly under-financed.

These were the flaws whose absence might have made a considerable difference to the smooth operation of the services.

First, the continued fragmentation of the medical profession: there were three branches of medicine—

The primary care doctors or general practitioners (about two thirds of the total, approximately 20 to 30,000);

The consultants or specialists (between 10 to 15,000) remain rigidly in the hospitals from which the General Practitioners are usually excluded except for social visits to patients;

The public health system of nurses and doctors who are very much a separate entity. Never did the sectors get together, not even today.

This bright new dream got off to a bad start because it promised too much. It was felt that there would now be a completely healthy nation requiring very little care and its cost was badly under estimated. It failed

to unite a divided profession to meet the problems ahead; and finally, it got under way with the wrong persons in charge since neither the doctors nor the politicians had the remotest idea of how a comprehensive national health service should operate. The doctors stood aside and let the politicians make the decisions. Worst of all, neither side had any idea that they were getting into something that required much more than they could provide in the way of men and money.

Promises were made to the General Practitioners (primary care providers) and to the Specialists or Consultants, but they could not be kept.

PRIMARY CARE PROVIDES (GPs—FAMILY PHYSICIANS)

The resistance of the family doctors was overcome by the promise that 2500 Health Centers would be provided to cover the entire country. In 1974, some 26 years after the inception of the National Health Service itself in 1948, only three hundred had been built and it was projected it would be 1980 before a total of 2000 had been reached.

Before the enactment of the NHS, each doctor owned his practice and sold it when he wanted. After 1948, practices were nationalized and taken over by the government. General Practitioners were no longer free to sell their practice nor could they move where they wanted. This could only be done by applying to the appropriate authority and by competing with the other GPs for a practice in a different part of the country. Meanwhile, they were promised they would be recompensed for the value of the practice when they retired at 65 and in the interim, they would get 2½ per cent interest per annum on the projected cost of the practice. They resisted this but since doctors in Britain are in general practice, it was the easiest of matters for the bureaucrats to hand out a health card to every citizen and ask him to choose his own doctor. At first, doctors resisted, but when they saw that colleagues were accepting these cards, they panicked and before long, the general practitioners were firmly in the fold by accepting the inevitability of government intervention, they had been roundly defeated and routed. The British Medical Association had failed to give suitable leadership and the scheme was a fait accompli.

While they waited for the promised Health Centers, they continued to practice in their own offices. The method of payment itself was reprehensible. In the beginning, they were allowed to take 3500 patients on their list and were paid \$3.00 or less per head, per year, whether they saw the patients or not. So no matter how many house or office calls were made, the capitation fee remained at this figure. The harder the doctor worked, the less he earned per hour. Where he had many old people in his practice, he was clearly at times, being paid nothing for many numerous house calls, a tradition of medicine in Great Britain.

Spectacles, teeth, wigs, medicine were all free and the calls on them were so great that some small deductible was included to control it. In time, the list was reduced to 2,500 per doctor and the capitation fee at the moment is somewhere in the region of \$4.00 per head, per year, with a loading fee for older people and emergencies and obstetric cases.

At the height of winter epidemics of upper respiratory disease, it was not uncommon for a doctor to see 50 to 100 patients in his office and to do 30 to 60 house calls in a day. His wife tended the phone at home and was an unpaid servant of the government. If he took a vacation he was expected to provide a replacement for his services at his own expense.

The quality of service given by British doctors has always been a very high one and many struggled for years to maintain this

standard. However, by 1966, the general practitioner was isolated from his patients in hospitals, overworked, underpaid and disillusioned.

Emigration of doctors occurred in large numbers. Hasty examination left the patient dissatisfied and one out of ten patients seen in the office were referred to the hospital, many having to wait several weeks to see a suitable consultant. Finally to quieten the revolt, the government gave them a substantial increase in capitation fee, bringing them up as closely as possible to the consultant in the hospital in terms of salary.

THE HOSPITALS AND THE SPECIALISTS

When the NHS Act became operative, the hospitals were nationalized and only one to two percent of the beds were placed aside for private practice. The Consultants were paid on a basis of half days. They were allowed to work full time for the state or on a part time basis of seven, eight or nine half days per week, the remainder of the time being allotted to private practice.

Although it had been promised that private practice would continue, there was bias against it from the outset and a theory that it was improper to have two systems operating within one framework. Waiting lists grew longer and many business executives elected to join private insurance schemes which let them choose their own specialists and to get a private bed in a hospital, thereby enabling them to receive treatment more rapidly. "Jumping the line" became common practice and it was naturally resented.

At the outset, competition for Consultant posts was intense. Even interns and residents had to compete for their posts and much time and expense was entailed in applying and appearing before selection boards. The simple idea that a doctor could take a residency, pass his specialists Boards, then go out and put up his shingle was no longer valid.

At times, as many as eighty doctors would apply for one specialist post. With growing disillusionment about promotion, many emigrated. Replacements at junior and even senior level were increasingly made by doctors from Africa, Jamaica or India who eventually filled 30 to 50 percent of the junior posts. Some of them were highly trained, well versed in English and quickly acceptable to the British people. Some had difficulty in communicating and these doctors were treated unfairly, relegated to under-doctored areas and hospitals handling large numbers of mental and geriatric patients.

The latest Labor Government has had increasing trouble with the consultants who finally began to "work to contract." Instead of doing their customary 60 or more hours per week, they delivered the hours their contract demanded, 38½ hours per week full time. The juniors were paid overtime to take the place of the seniors and the situation deteriorated in the early months of 1975 until the consultants were given an increase in salary of the order of 30 to 35 percent, at which point they stopped working to contract.

Then it was announced that the government meant to close all private beds in state hospitals and that private practice in the future would have to take place outside the system. For practical purposes, this was the death knell of private practice in Great Britain.

Now the situation is chaotic. Junior doctors, i.e. interns and residents, threatened to strike (their overtime pay has been restricted due to a national freeze on wages) and the senior doctors are greatly dissatisfied that they now can no longer practice privately within the NHS.

Other complications have been introduced by the fact that many of the non-medical staff in the hospital are unionized. They in turn resent the carrying out of private

practice in hospitals and some have refused to have anything to do with any aspect of private practice in any state hospitals.

All of this serves to illustrate the inevitable consequences of the mistakes that were made in the beginning. If it had been the intent of Labor and Conservative governments in Great Britain to abolish private practice within the NHS, this should have been indicated from the outset. The hypocrisy has now come home to roost.

THE GOOD SIDE

No one can pretend that everything is bad about the British National Health Service. It may have miscalculated, promised too much and delivered too little but it is still, for all its failings, widely accepted by the people.

Doctors are free to order treatment without undue consideration of the cost involved. The patient has freedom from medical bills and of course, this is the most attractive aspect of all and is the one that is constantly reiterated. But nothing is free, and the cost is borne by increasing taxation. As medicine becomes more sophisticated and inflation hits the whole country, the cost has increased by six times the original estimate. Consider the reaction on this side of the Atlantic if a U.S.A. National Health Service escalated from \$100 billion in 1975 to \$600 billion by the end of the century.

If the family practitioner in Great Britain has good relations with the consultants in hospitals, it is possible for him to get a second opinion from some of the best doctors in the world and with good luck the patient will get excellent treatment free in hospitals. If, however, the doctor has a poor working relationship with the hospital, the patient may wait many weeks before getting an appointment and months or even years before receiving treatment in the hospitals. One can appreciate very readily the difficulties encountered by a doctor from Pakistan whose English is not perfect, and who does not have the confidence or influence to secure such services for his patient.

BRITAIN HAS ALL THE ILLS OF THE UNITED STATES

On the other hand, it is only fair to say that Great Britain has practically all of the ills which afflict the United States at the moment. Maldistribution of doctors is almost as bad there as here. Under these circumstances, the Commonwealth doctors have to accept service in these areas if they wish to practice at all.

Language difficulties are now a considerable problem and Commonwealth and overseas doctors are now forced to take a language test—many of them failing at the first attempt. This has caused considerable annoyance to the well-organized Pakistani doctors and considerable disquiet to the British public.

Costs rise inevitably and uncontrollably. The hospital bed in the National Health Service where patients may be in a large 20 bedded ward, costs \$78.00 per day. The emergence of a new private hospital in London, called the Wellington, with a rate of \$350 per day is enough to make even American eyebrows rise. This hospital can obviously only be used by the very wealthy, mostly from abroad and it boasts a wine list, food menu and expensive uniforms for orderlies.

BRITISH NATIONAL HEALTH SERVICE—THE BAD SIDE

Why then is the British National Health Service in such bad shape? In 1948, the profession had no idea how a national Health Service should be constructed. It stood aside and let the politicians make the decisions. The politicians did not know how to do it either. There was chaos.

Nobody had the courage to point out that it was totally impossible in terms of man-

power and money to provide a comprehensive free health service to all.

NHS has always been the Cinderella of the nationalized "industries" and the financial ceiling has been kept as low as possible. New hospitals were promised, but in fifteen years only one was built. Even now, instead of building new hospitals, wings are being added to dirty, dingy, dilapidated, 19th century hospitals. The promised Health Centers have not arrived.

The salaries of the non-medical staff have been kept low until recently while the cost of the service has far exceeded what was expected, as has happened with Medicare and Medicaid.

Geriatric and mental hospitals have been the most neglected of all. In these hospitals, there may be 80 patients to a ward with inadequate nursing staff, often not as highly trained as in teaching hospitals and with a medical staff who are there because they cannot get a job in the more central, glamorous university hospitals. It is a sad state of affairs when a service which started with such high motives ends by turning its back on old and mentally sick people.

All of this has led to mass emigration which occurs in waves as discontent reaches a peak. Such a peak was reached in the late 50's and early 60's and another is in sight with a large number of British graduates taking their ECFMG each year and older consultants emigrating to other parts of the world. Part-time or full-time, the really good consultant resents the fact that he gives many hours of free time to state medicine yet is not allowed to do private practice. Even if private practice is taken out of bounds, it is fairly safe to assume that any Socialist government will do its very best to discourage the building of private hospitals and to limit as completely as they can the development of any type of health care outside the service which they regard as the best in the world.

As the general practitioners became increasingly overworked and under paid, they have less time for leisure or for continuing medical education and eventually a truculence develops in their attitude whereby they try to insulate themselves from the general public by being off call and delegating the duties to other members of their team or even to doctors who are brought in from an agency to substitute for them. The only person who suffers from this is the patient.

The general practitioner has been forced by a form of moral blackmail to over-prescribe and to issue certificates for absence from work, often for inadequate reasons. It is easy to say he should not do so, but the expectation of the patient that his doctor will provide him with every type of medicine and any type of certificate is now too firmly established.

A doctor does not, nowadays, pick up his stethoscope or his thermometer when a patient enters the consulting room. He reaches for his prescription pad or for the book of certificates that excuse patients from work. One can hardly blame him when at 9:00 P.M. he may still have 50 or 60 people to see in his office. He barely has time to sort out the dangerously ill people from the worried well. He resorts to sending one out of ten to the hospital where the miserable wait for an appointment starts and joins the mounting admission waiting list.

The British National Health Service has been reported as being more humane than medicine in America but that it certainly is more wasteful is shown by the fact that a patient who is requiring prostatic surgery may have to spend another three days in the hospital if an X-ray of the kidneys precedes the operation. Likewise, the average length of stay in British hospitals is 11 or 12 days as compared to two thirds to one half of that in the United States. The length of stay after prostatic operations is exactly twice that

which is required by the author in Illinois. In other words, the British National Health Service has a tendency to mediocrity and carelessness with public money.

THE LESSON FOR THE UNITED STATES

Our citizens would do well to look before leaping into any program of National Health Insurance.

THE DEMOCRATIC PROCESS

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, lately I have been thinking about democracy and what it requires of us. The following brief statement, entitled "The Democratic Process," is inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the benefit and use of my colleagues:

THE DEMOCRATIC PROCESS

I. THE FUTURE OF DEMOCRACY

We all know that the democratic way of life is on trial around the world, and although we cannot say what the ultimate verdict will be it is possible that it will not be favorable. A quick look at developments on the world scene will convince us of the magnitude of the threat.

A. Paternalistic and totalitarian government

Freedom House, a private group which has monitored political and civil liberties around the world for the past quarter century, published some alarming statistics recently. Taking freedom to consist in—

The independent rule of law.

The right to dissent.

The existence of institutional checks on the executive.

The right to choose leaders.

The independence of the news media.

The right to sue the government for redress of grievance.

The guarantee of personal privacy.

Freedom House found that of the earth's 4.063 billion inhabitants living in 158 nations and 51 dependent territories—

804 million or 19.8%, living in 40 nations and 17 territories, were fully free.

1.436 billion or 35.3%, living in 53 nations and 31 territories, were only partly free.

1.823 billion or 44.9%, living in 65 nations and 3 territories, had no freedom at all.

If one adds to these grim figures the fact that only 29 of the 40 nations where full freedom existed were democracies, then it certainly looks as if the future of democracy is bleak. The basic political and civil rights that we Americans take so much for granted have been rejected in most areas of the world.

These facts and figures have prompted many political analysts to remark that democracy may actually be a "holdover" form of government or even a relic, something of mere historical interest, something irrelevant to the future of human affairs.

Even without the Freedom House study, the daily newspapers might have led us to suspect that something was amiss. Reports of devastating setbacks to freedom have poured in from

1. Asia

A declaration of emergency 19 months ago ended the existence of democracy in India. In one fell swoop 620 million people were deprived of many of their political and civil liberties. By jailing the opposition, muzzling the press, suppressing the judiciary and ramming "constitutional reform" through an intimidated parliament, Indira Gandhi effectively crushed the growth and darkened the

future of democracy in the world's second most populous land.

Other Asian nations where freedom has been either diminished or eliminated include:

Sri Lanka.

Bangladesh.

Laos.

Cambodia.

South Vietnam.

Thailand.

The Philippines.

What happened in these places is a matter of public record.

2. Latin America

One of the most stinging defeats of democracy in recent history occurred in Latin America when Chile, a nation whose vital legislature and 160-year experiment in democracy inspired pride at home and envy abroad, fell under the sway of a totalitarian military junta in 1973. It is impossible to predict whether a democratic form of government will soon be restored there.

Other Latin American countries where freedom has recently disappeared are Uruguay and Argentina. At the present time only 5 of the 21 nations in Latin America are democracies. Worse yet, only 2 of the 5 democracies are considered stable.

3. Africa

Among all the states on the vast continent of Africa only 2, Gambia and Botswana, are completely free. Other states languish under civilian dictatorships, rule by military junta, systems of apartheid and other undesirable forms of government and social policy.

4. Europe

In Europe, long a bastion of democratic institutions, the situation seems to be deteriorating. The so-called "Eurocommunists" have made significant gains in Italy and France, and their commitment to democratic processes is questionable. The twin pressures of regionalism and political extremism threaten to delay or block moves toward democracy in Spain. The inexperienced Portuguese democracy, plagued by soaring inflation and the inability to restrain its spendthrift habits, is tottering on the brink of collapse.

B. Human rights

The increasing disregard for human rights in many parts of the world is also cause for concern.

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights states that "no one shall be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment." This declaration is subscribed to by virtually every nation on earth. However, like many other lofty principles it is widely ignored in practice.

Amnesty International, the highly respected human rights organization headquartered in London, estimates that in the last decade the systematic violation of human rights has been official policy in some 60 countries. Last year alone there were more than 40 offending states.

Among the most publicized violations are: Constant police surveillance and harassment.

Seizure of property.

Detainment and imprisonment without charge.

Torture.

Summary execution.

Such practices are, of course, abhorrent to those of us who believe in the democratic way of life. But it is one of the sad truths of the last decade that rarely before have such practices been so widespread.

C. The international news media

If these encroachments on human freedom were not enough, there would be the movement to suppress the international news media.

An independent study group has warned of the danger of manipulation of the news media by governments as a tool to stimulate economic development and further political ends. Proponents of such government control are especially vocal in the third world. They argue that Western news agencies distort and downplay the importance of events in their countries, and they believe that their governments can give a more accurate picture of third world conditions.

The most controversial development in this area was the Soviet resolution introduced at the general conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization at Nairobi, Kenya in November of last year. The resolution declared that states are responsible for the activities in the international sphere of all mass media under their jurisdiction. It may very well be passed in 1978 even though it is widely regarded as an attempt to get an agency of the United Nations to give its moral sanction to the government control of all news media within a country.

The demise of independent, international journalism is threatened.

D. America

The survival of democracy in America is not written in the stars, and some people believe that we ourselves may not have too many more years of freedom. These doom-sayers are often regarded as extremists, but nonetheless they do cite some disturbing trends.

1. Ignorance of Government

If democracy requires a citizenry informed in things governmental, then we may be in for trouble.

In their interesting new book *Public Opinion*, Robert Lane and David Sears report the results of a survey in which they asked the following questions:

What are the three branches of the Federal government called?

How many Senators are there in Washington from your state?

What is the Electoral College?

What do you know about the Bill of Rights?

A composite of all groups polled revealed that 81%, 45%, 65% and 79% of those responding to the questions gave incorrect answers in each of the 4 instances.

The record was even more dismal when it came to individual Representatives and their stands on the issues. Only about 30% of the American public of voting age know the name of their Representative. No more than 10% know how he or she stands on major issues.

It cannot be doubted that low levels of political information and participation have adverse effects on our democratic system. For example, how is a Representative to serve the interests of his or her constituents when they either have no opinion on most issues or have so little information that their opinions on most issues are purely emotional? Worse yet, on what does the uninformed constituent base a vote in the general election? All too often the vote is based on the candidate's appearance, family, accent, etc. The ability of candidates to succeed without discussing the issues is extremely dangerous to any democracy.

2. Lack of Confidence in American Institutions

The problem of ignorance is serious, but there is also the problem of confidence.

Major polls have confirmed the sense of national drift and alienation. For example, the Harris poll recently showed that 65% of all Americans feel that their voice no longer counts. This sense of estrangement stood at 34% just 10 years ago.

Similarly, confidence in key American institutions has fallen drastically in the same period:

Executive branch: 41% in 1966; 11% today.

Congress: 42% in 1966; 9% today.
 Supreme Court: 50% in 1966; 22% today.
 Religious institutions: 41% in 1966; 24% today.
 Major business concerns: 55% in 1966; 16% today.
 Military institutions: 62% in 1966; 23% today.

Organized labor: 22% in 1966; 10% today.
 Furthermore, 61% of those interviewed and responding expressed dissatisfaction with their lives, and 66% believed that lasting peace was not possible in their lifetimes. A full 67% thought that racial and religious hatred could never be eradicated.

E. Summary

Challenges to the democratic process, of course, are not new. They are with us now and they will always be with us. The histories of this nation and other democratic lands can be described, and indeed have been described; as a grand conflict between those who believe in the viability of the democratic process and those who do not.

Here in America the conflict began when the nation was born. John Adams said, "There never was a democracy that did not commit suicide," but Thomas Jefferson said, "Cherish the spirit of the people." Alexander Hamilton feared an unbridled power lodged in the majority, but Andrew Jackson feared it lodged anywhere else. Fisher Ames spoke of the tyranny of the many, Abraham Lincoln spoke of his mystical faith in the common man and the government of the people.

As I look at the number and complexity of national and international issues before Congress, I become increasingly convinced that we shall have to bring new strength to the democratic process both at home and abroad.

You will be glad to hear that it is not my intention to try to solve all the problems of democracy today. My purpose is much more limited. I would like to make a few comments on the requirements of the democratic process, what must be done if democracy is to flourish. I am not at all certain that the process is fully understood by enough of us.

II. WHAT IS THE DEMOCRATIC PROCESS?

What is the democratic process? We must first understand that it is a way of making decisions and managing affairs, whether they be the decisions and affairs of the Federal government, the Rotary Club or Graw Bone, Indiana. Partisans of this process try to make decisions and manage affairs in keeping with the reasonable demands of the majority, but with the fullest possible respect for the rights of the minority.

Unfortunately, there is probably no such thing as "democratic instinct." Democratic behavior is learned by us, not born in us. In recognition of this fact the Founding Fathers, having agreed upon a set of principles and a form of government to preserve order and protect liberty, strove to develop in the people a sophisticated understanding of the democratic process. They knew that, in order to make the system work, the people had to understand what the democratic process required of them. They knew that their noble experiment would fail if an insufficient number of people failed to get into their very bones what democracy meant.

III. DEMANDS OF THE DEMOCRATIC PROCESS

What, then, does the democratic process require of us?

A. Concern for individuals

Above all things, the democratic process demands a concern for the individual.

I suspect that if we were to attempt to put into a single sentence what America is all about, most of us would say that America is a country which cares for people and gives them the opportunity to develop. The common man calls it "a chance to improve one's lot" and the sociologist calls it "upward mobility," but whatever its name it has drawn immigrants to America for over 200 years. Of course, no one will contend we fulfill this ideal perfectly, but likewise no one will contend that we do not try harder than anyone else.

Once this single demand is grasped, we can easily see what else we must do. The democratic process demands that we respect and honor individuals not on the basis of status, religion, race, wealth, and membership in a given group, but simply because they are persons. It demands that all our policies should be directed toward the well-being of individuals, not just the ones we agree with, but all.

These demands are not to be understood in negative sense. Respect for another is more than failing to insult or abuse him, just as honor for another is more than letting him go his way alone. On the contrary, these demands mean that—
 The other person's views must be considered.
 His dignity must be enhanced.
 His development must be promoted.
 His opportunities must be widened.
 Such things cannot be accomplished by passive onlookers. Democracy prevails upon us to be active.

Wait Whitman, the great poet and philosopher of American democracy, penned a line that seems to me to cut to the heart of the matter. He wrote, "The whole theory of the Universe is directed to one single individual—namely to you." What better expression is there of the essence of the democratic process? What does democracy mean if not that the individual is at the center of things?

However, we should take care not to place the person on too high a pedestal. At the heart of democracy is a person who is imperfect, who needs criticism, who makes mistakes. In a democracy no one's ideas are sacrosanct. Only by steady examination and criticism of ourselves and our points of view can our mistaken ideas be corrected and our growth assured.

Naturally, we all have our own ideas, proposals and solutions. But, in a democracy, we must expose them to analysis by other people and, as hard as it may be to do, reject or revise them when it is apparent that we are in the wrong. We could take a lesson in this from the workings of our own Congress. What is footdragging and temporizing to some is the give-and-take of democracy in action to others. No Senator or Representative expects his or her bills to sail through Congress unobstructed. Tough battles in the committees and on the floor are commonplace. This is as it should be in a legislature that is truly democratic.

One more point needs to be made about the relation between democracy and the individual. The democratic process really makes a little bet on each one of us. It bets that, if we are given freedom, we shall respond to the challenges of a free life. It bets that, if we are given freedom, we shall—

Improve ourselves.
 Take advantage of the opportunities given us.
 Live constructively.
 Summon up our strengths.
 Respond to challenge.
 Accept the imperatives of responsibility.
 Sometimes the bet is lost, but more often than not it is won.

B. Tolerance

Because of the emphasis the democratic process places on the value of individuals, it demands that we maintain an attitude of tolerance toward other people. The renowned jurist Learned Hand captured this attitude when he said, "The spirit of liberty is the spirit that is not too sure it is right." We are tolerant of others because we have set aside the smugness of the self-assured.

The democratic process requires that we respect and honor individual differences, not only individuals. It calls on us to care about people one by one, not *en masse*, allowing them their choice of life styles and their right to do things their own way. It demands something extraordinary of us: we must care about the liberty and rights of others as much as we care about our own liberty and rights. A meaningful shibboleth comes to mind: I may not agree with what you say, but I shall defend to my death your right to say it.

C. Trust

The democratic process also requires that we trust the other fellow. This trust is not blind and indiscriminating, a looking away from every action of every person. Rather, it is a prudent attitude of confidence that gives the other fellow the benefit of the doubt.

We do not police everyone. We do not scrutinize every gesture. We do not force every move. By and large, the democratic process leaves it up to you to—

Fill out your tax forms.

Stop at the stop sign.

Obeys the speed limit.

Imagine what it would be like if this simple trust were absent. In his monumental work *Gulag Archipelago*, Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn documents the case of a devoted Communist who was sentenced to 10 years at hard labor for smiling at a picture of Josef Stalin. To us this is a gross outrage, an unconscionable violation of the sort of trust that underpins democracy.

D. Respect for rules

The democratic process also obliges us to respect the rules of the game, whether we agree with them or not.

We respect the ballot, not the bullet.

We respect fair expression, not slander.

We respect the right of peaceful assembly, not the right to riot.

E. Fight for beliefs

If we really love democracy, then we shall be expected to fight for something we believe in as hard as we can. However, if defeat comes, as it often does, we must yield to it knowing that this is best and that we may return to the fray to fight another day.

How many times have I seen one of my colleagues gracefully surrender the floor of the House to an opponent after a bitter struggle? So it should be in America.

F. Perseverance

The democratic process demands the perseverance of the true patriot and not the flagging resolve of "sunshine soldier." Some persons, when they survey the national agenda or the ramifications of a particular problem on that agenda, become too quickly discouraged. They are there for the parade, but not for the long, hard pull necessary to get things accomplished.

Examples of this requirement of perseverance are not hard to find. Extreme perseverance is necessary to the process of amending the Constitution. Delays of years are typical. Even though one may not agree with the proposed Equal Rights or Human Life amendments, one cannot but admire the tenacity of the supporters of those amendments.

G. Consent of the governed

The democratic process requires that we understand a vital principle which underlies our constitutional system: the consent of the governed. We, must be very, very clear about the meaning of that principle.

It means that public policy must be subject to broad discussion.

It means that key decisions must be arrived at openly.

It means that political leaders must be chosen in free elections.

It means that there must be freedom of speech, freedom of association and freedom of petition for redress of grievance.

It means that power will be diffused through society, with no groups insulated from competition or criticism.

It means that decision-makers will be held accountable for what they decide.

It means that individuals may organize and lobby for their interests.

It means that individuals may actively question the actions of leaders.

It means that individuals have pride enough not to be awed by authority, but humility enough to respect other points of view.

It means that those who win elections must be accepted, but those who steal elections must be opposed.

Lastly, it means that we understand that the consent of the governed, even though firmly embedded in our Constitution, is not forever secure, but must be reaffirmed by each one of us each day.

H. Compromise

The democratic process also requires of us an appreciation of the political process as the art of compromise, the "art of the possible," as Count Cavour put it more than a century ago. Without the constant exercise of compromise and accommodation, a responsive government simply cannot exist in this vast, complex diverse country of ours.

We must always remember that no single group, political party or politician has a monopoly on virtue, patriotism or knowledge. The democratic process does not provide perfect answers, but through compromise it does provide suitable answers. Compromise is the very cement that keeps this country from falling apart. The path of history is strewn with the wreckage of once democratic governments whose leaders ignored this truth.

I. Public good

Finally, we should note that the democratic process demands that each of us focus our attention on the public good. The question is not what is good for Lee Hamilton, nor what is good for the labor union, nor what is good for the entrepreneur, nor what is good for the farmer, but what in the end is good for the nation.

Democracy demands that we worry less about what happens to ourselves and the organizations we happen to cherish, and more about what happens to our country. It demands that we do in our time what the Founding Fathers did in their time: define what is meant by the public good. It demands that we ask of ourselves what President John F. Kennedy asked of us: not what our country can do for us, but what we can do for our country. Few things are more important today than our compliance with these demands.

J. Summary

As I have suggested tonight, the person who casts his or her lot with the democratic process will find that it asks difficult things. He or she must—

Act with conviction while recognizing human limitations.

Enjoy, and not merely accept, the fact that others disagree.

Fight hard, and then compromise.

Distinguish between helping others and dictating to them.

However, there are substantial rewards:

A sense of dignity.

A stake in the community and nation.

A chance to shape the environment.

A respect for others.

The satisfaction that comes from working together with one's cobelievers toward common goals.

The privilege to use intelligence, talent and energy to meet the challenges of the day with hope.

I would say that democracy is well worth the effort.

CANCER RESEARCH

HON. GENE TAYLOR

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, anyone checking the science reports from the National Cancer Institute knows that, while the world is waiting for the big breakthrough in cancer research, very important progress is being made in improving already known therapies. For instance, the historical rate of survival after 2 years from diagnosis of osteogenic sarcoma, bone cancer, is about 25 percent. But in the Sidney Farber Cancer Center in Boston an ongoing clinical trial involving several dozen patients has shown that 80 percent are disease free after 2 years, and I want to stress that is disease free.

If that result can be achieved in one major center, it can be achieved in others. As a matter of fact, Dr. Isaac Djerassi, the leader in one aspect of the new therapy used at Sidney Farber, works at Mercy Catholic Medical Center in Philadelphia. Already, therefore, several institutions are demonstrating this amazing advance from 25 percent surviving to 80 percent disease-free after 2 years even though much remains to be learned from further research. We know that many more lives could be saved if these achievements were duplicated and translated into improved patient care at the community level whenever professional and technological resources permit.

When the American Association of Community Cancer Centers met in Washington, D.C., on January 20, they invited our colleague TIM LEE CARTER who is a physician himself and ranking minority member of the Health and Environmental Subcommittee, to address their members. Because of his expertise and the merit of his speech, I offer for inclusion in the RECORD the text of the remarks prepared for that session.

I want to draw particular attention to the emphasis in the speech on community hospitals working more with the American College of Surgeons' Commission on cancer program. Some 750 hospitals already are a part of that system which helps these institutions take advantage of the best therapies that the National Cancer Institute can recommend. The American Cancer Society also works in cooperation with the surgeons' commission on cancer program to improve cancer-patient care nationwide.

I should hope that some other Members might find it useful to call this information to the attention of hospitals in their own districts.

The remarks follow:

PREPARED REMARKS OF HON. TIM LEE CARTER

It's a pleasure for me to be here with you today and to enjoy your good fellowship.

Having practiced medicine for many years in rural Kentucky I know from first-hand experience both the challenges and the rewards of being a community physician.

In fact, when I came to Congress, some claimed I had "retired"—and others said I

was just plain "tired". But let me assure you that I've found my work here equally challenging in many ways.

As ranking Minority Member of our Health Subcommittee I have a real interest in what you do, in what you can tell the Congress, and what we can accomplish together.

You too face important challenges in your daily work. And there's no question in my mind that your Association has a vital role to play in making sure every cancer patient receives optimum care.

I want to warn you, however, that I do not believe that each of us trying to do our best necessarily means each of us should try to do the whole job.

This is a complex piece of work. You must see patients at a period in medical history which is sort of an in-between time.

On the one hand, science has not unlocked the key to cancer, the etiology. There are no simple remedies—no vaccines.

On the other hand, science has produced some very important palliatives. In fact, for eleven types of cancer, medicine has reason to speak of cures. But the available regimens are very, very complicated to administer.

Some say we'll find a cure before we find a cause, though it is my belief that with careful study we may actually find the cause before the cure. The challenge is immense indeed, and requires tremendous dedication and commitment. But some day we will be successful. Some day, no doubt, the therapies will be surer. They will be simpler. And like the iron lung, some of our more elaborate forms of treatment will become outmoded.

But, in this in-between time, difficult choices must be made every day. Choices about proper regimen—where it should be administered—and who should administer it. The decisions are many, but I am convinced that a multi-disciplinary team must be involved. Good things are available in diagnosis, surgery, radiology, chemotherapy, and immunotherapy. We ought to take advantage of them. We owe it to the patient to give him the best that medicine has to offer. There's so much to know—to learn—and the team approach can prove invaluable.

From my perspective as a physician and as a legislator, I think we need to maximize our potential at all levels. We need the tertiary centers—the comprehensive cancer centers. We need the specialized cancer centers—we need the research community which draws its support from N.I.H.—And we certainly need the best competence we can build at the community level.

Here there is work to be done. What is needed, I believe, is a solid base of community support and involvement in the cancer field. Since so much of cancer care begins at the community level, it is critical that we engage the energies and commitment of all those involved at the grass-roots level. This is the work you can address so well. We need your support.

Today, I would like you to consider one suggestion I feel might greatly enhance your own work. It will fit well with your program, and it will be of benefit to the cancer patient.

It concerns the American College of Surgeons' Commission on Cancer.

You have already begun to cooperate in many ways with this Commission. And I'm not going to pretend to give you pointers on how to do that job. I am only going to express my opinion that the best wisdom is to concentrate on making that aspect of your program one of the most important things you do—one of the biggest investments of your time.

You know that the 750 hospitals which have cancer programs approved by the American College of Surgeons treat about half of all cancer patients in this country.

Comprehensive cancer centers treat, maybe, fifteen percent.

This certainly puts a heavy burden on the small hospitals, and I know your Association is deeply devoted to improving cancer treatment at the community level.

That is exactly what I am suggesting. We need to work to strengthen and coordinate our capabilities at the local level. We need to develop cancer programs at the community level which provide a greater awareness among all physicians of the need for systematized detection activities. Detecting cancer early is so important for effective treatment. Continuing education programs are part of this process. Physicians need to learn about those regimens which are capable of extending life.

But just tugging at the physician's sleeve is not enough. We need to give him something practical to do. That is exactly what the College of Surgeons' Commission on Cancer does.

Through the Commission you can get involved with the establishment of hospital tumor registries and hospital education programs; you can develop standards for treatment and therapy and thereby gain approval by the College of the hospital's cancer action. You may also have a chance to participate in special studies such as the one going on now in connection with liver damage, possibly caused by oral contraceptives.

Your organization already has made an excellent beginning in this direction. I am aware of the good work you are doing.

Dr. Herbert Kerman of Daytona Beach has made a national reputation for himself as a radiotherapist. He has been a driving force in statewide cancer program coordination in Florida. You have chosen well to put him in a liaison position between your organization and the College of Surgeons.

Also, in my own state of Kentucky, we find examples of the important contributions which community cancer groups can make. Under the capable direction of Dr. David Goldenberg, the Ephraim McDowell Community Cancer Network has begun to develop an effective cancer control program for our area. District Cancer Councils have been formed for each of the nine health districts in eastern Kentucky to assess local needs in cancer management. Hospital-based cancer liaisons are being established to provide information on available resources to cancer patients. They are creating a coordinated network of resources at the community level.

There are certainly many important ways that your Association can work with the Commission to build up the local base of support that is needed to provide a truly effective cancer control program. Developing early detection programs, sponsoring cancer education programs, and building communication networks are just some of the ways to help strengthen and coordinate our resources.

Let's consider now some of the promising developments in our comprehensive cancer centers and how these advances can best be translated into improved patient care. Consider metastasized breast cancer:

The historical survival rate on single drug chemotherapy after surgery has been eight months. But recently, chemotherapy plus 5-FU, Adriamycin, cyclophosphamide, B.C.G. and immunotherapy have increased the survival rates in one trial of 45 patients to 22 months, and the trial is still underway.

That's almost triple the historical survival time. While it is too early to go out to the public with big applause for medicine—those kinds of data tell us that long-term survival is more promising now than a few years ago.

Let's look at some other results. In undifferentiated small-cell type of lung cancer, the historical remission rate of three to six months is about 5 percent. The National

Cancer Institute has reported a study where 20 out of 21 patients under chemotherapy and radiotherapy showed remission—or 95 percent compared to 5 percent.

So, it is obviously important to know when to send a patient to a comprehensive setting where the complex regimens are routine.

Another example involves the Sidney Farber Center in Boston. There, in treatment of osteogenic sarcoma, they are getting over 80 percent two-year disease-free survival rates where the historical rate has been 20 to 25 percent. No patient should be denied the "citrovorum factor rescue" treatment where it is indicated. And when it comes to treatment, it's important to know our limitations at the community level. While removal of basal cell epithelioma is a procedure which can be done at the community level, (I have done it myself) the comprehensive centers are the places for the more complex regimens.

Personally, I believe that leukemia should not be treated without the supervision of a specialist. Blood tests and bone marrows must be done by pathologists who have had special training. At St. Jude's in Memphis, for example, Dr. Joseph Simone is an expert in childhood leukemia. Dr. Emil Freireich is known for his development of a protocol for the treatment of childhood leukemia. Within the cancer field, there are of course other specialists. Dr. Emil Freireich has had experience with the treatment of osteogenic sarcoma, and Dr. Bernard Fisher is one of several known for his work in treating breast cancer. There are of course many others.

These individuals have made outstanding contributions to the field of cancer. They have no desire to strip communities of their patients. They already have their hands full. These specialists will provide consultation. When a regimen of treatment has been delineated by an oncologist, then followup treatment can be done in the community hospital with close communication and back-up available. And when appropriate, these oncologists will treat patients.

You may have read articles in "Parade Magazine" and elsewhere saying that we should send all of the cancer patients to the comprehensive centers. Clearly that would be an unwise use of our cancer resources. That is not my view.

I believe that patients should be sent to the more comprehensive centers when that level of care is required. And the capacity to make that critical referral decision accurately is what we need to develop at the community level.

To assist in this effort, I believe that adoption of the College of Surgeons' Commission on Cancer Program should be helpful. The Commission has about 500 surgeon liaison fellows throughout the United States along with liaison associates from other disciplines. Next year they will have 1,000.

I urge you to work with them. Use their linkages with the College—and also work to strengthen your own network of resources at the community level. Show them that your organization has a unique function and that you know the community best. Continue to do all you can to integrate its capabilities into the total cancer program. In that way, referrals will be made when necessary and treatment at home will be optimized.

And now, just a few words about what's happening in Congress.

The National Cancer Act will be renewed just one year this session as a courtesy to the Administration so that the White House can have some input next year, if it so desires.

Authorizations will be increased, but not a great deal.

After the simple one-year extensions are completed, both Houses of Congress will

spend a good bit of time re-examining the entire field of biomedical research funded by the Federal Government. The Senate, especially, is planning an extensive re-evaluation of this area. There are some who claim that our "returns" from the cancer field have not measured up to our investment, and there are others who challenge the merits of N.C.I.'s independence.

Personally, I think that N.C.I.'s position within N.I.H. should be preserved. I think that the categorical disease approach to research is invaluable. It provides the basis for a direct link between the laboratory and the practitioner. And in terms of funding research, I believe we should make our allocations on the relative morbidity, mortality and economic impact of these diseases. I'm working on expanding this approach currently.

Overall, we can expect a good deal of controversy and probably some changes in both the Cancer Program and biomedical research in general. You can be of service to the country and to me if you will bring me your views as this discussion moves along. If you have any fundamental changes you would like to see in the law, work them out carefully and give them to me for the next year. I promise to give your ideas careful consideration.

Now I'd like to bring up an issue of special concern to me: the Food and Drug Administration's authority over new anticancer drug testing.

For a period ranging from several months to almost two years the Food and Drug Administration has been telling the National Cancer Institute that several drugs are lacking in data so they should not be used in clinical trials. Dr. Gerald Bodey, for example, has told me personally of his experience—that several promising drugs for cancer treatment have not been released.

For many years N.C.I. and F.D.A. worked hand in glove to protect human research subjects and to push drug development. Recently changes in personnel have broken down that close partnership—and F.D.A. has begun to treat N.C.I. as if it were a for-profit firm in dire need of close surveillance.

Nevertheless, the law is the law, and of course N.C.I. should obey it.

But F.D.A.'s administration of the law has been unusual. It is criminal (some in science feel) for F.D.A. to hold up drug development on the basis of minor regulatory particulars—such as whether an investigator of Nobel-prize caliber has brought his bibliography up to date. That sort of thing has been happening.

Fortunately, after several of us began considering taking away from F.D.A. its authority over N.C.I. negotiations between the two government agencies turned productive. I am happy to report that nine experimental drugs were released about two weeks ago for clinical trials—a major victory.

This situation will bear watching. I hope the accord continues and improves. You may be sure our Subcommittee will monitor this matter. I have a deep, personal interest in it. And, I hope you will keep me informed of any drug difficulties your own community projects might encounter.

In closing, I would like to repeat that I think you have a very significant role to play. If you will expand the number of hospitals with approved cancer programs, continue to consolidate your resources at the community level and develop linkages to other levels of care, you will not only be serving the patient, but you will put your own Association in a priority position to participate in whatever the future holds. You have made an excellent beginning with good, strong leadership and I know you will keep up the good work.

Thank you.

PENALIZING THE VETERAN

HON. CECIL L. HEFTTEL

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. HEFTTEL. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today under cosponsorship with Congressman AKAKA of Hawaii a bill to amend title 5 of the United States Code to prohibit the consideration of certain matters in the determination of cost-of-living allowances for employees stationed outside the continental United States.

Consider, if you will, a veteran of the U.S. Armed Forces who retires after 20 years of service and is then employed by the Federal Government as a civil servant. Imagine that sitting next to him and doing the exact same work is a non-veteran.

Then consider that the veteran is paid a good deal less for his work than the nonveteran, even though they both hold the same GS grade and length of service.

Such a situation would seem improbable and unjust, yet this is exactly what is happening in Hawaii and other communities where Federal employees receive a cost of living allowance—COLA—to compensate for their much higher living costs when compared to Federal employees working in Washington, D.C.

By administrative action, the U.S. Civil Service Commission ruled last year that retired military personnel who work for the Federal Government—and the spouses of active or retired military personnel—are not authorized to receive COLA because of their access to military PX and commissary facilities.

The commission cited statistics purporting to show that these commissary and PX benefits offset the higher cost of living in Hawaii for which Federal employees receive COLA.

At the same time, the commission increased COLA for nonveterans to 17½ percent of their base salary. COLA is now being phased out for retired veterans, and by the end of this year, they will be making 17½ percent less than other employees for comparable work.

The Civil Service Commission's action was ill-conceived for many reasons, but perhaps the most fundamental is that it penalizes military retirees for their years of service to their country.

When these people retired from 20 or more years of active duty, they did not do so under an obligation to utilize the PX and commissary system. They earned the right to enjoy these benefits if they so choose, but they were not then and should not now be obliged to shop at these facilities, as the commission's ruling implies.

In addition, the commission is wrong in its assertion that prices in military facilities are more than 17 percent lower than in civilian stores. Any wise shopper can buy goods in civilian supermarkets and drug stores at prices equal to or less than those found in the military facilities. Dozens of letters from men and women affected by the COLA ruling attest to this essential fact.

These families will continue to shop in civilian stores because they know they can meet or beat commissary prices. But they will be forced to adopt a lower standard of living because of their loss of COLA.

Still other retired persons never avail themselves of their right to shop in commissaries or PX facilities because of the distance between their homes and the nearest such facility. Many affected families testify that the cost of gasoline, which is very high in Hawaii, would be greater than any savings that they might achieve. This does not even take into account the lost time, the added congestion of an already overloaded highway system or the additional air pollution that would result.

The elimination of COLA for these families is an ironic postscript to their years of military service. It also is grossly unfair to the wives of retired servicemen.

A woman employed as a career civil servant suffers a 17½ percent reduction in pay if she marries a military retiree. This clearly could not have been the intent of the Civil Service Commission, but this is the effect of the ruling. There is no way to justify a reduction of pay for employees who have done nothing during their employment to precipitate a pay cut.

I am sure you will agree, Mr. Speaker, that the termination of an economic benefit on the basis of prior military service has the effect of penalizing the veteran. I urge my colleagues to support this bill and return a just and well-deserved employee benefit to the men and women who have served their country honorably.

THE SOVIET-UNITED STATES
MILITARY BALANCE—PART I

HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, the beginning of the Carter administration and the fiscal year 1978 budget provide the opportunity for a fresh review of our foreign and defense policies. Many of us believe that progressive new policies can best be fostered through a rational and open public debate in which all points of view are presented. Unfortunately the public debate thus far has been dominated largely by the strident voices urging a return to cold war policies. Through leaked intelligence estimates and implausible "worst case" scenarios their goal appears to be to constrain President Carter from taking new initiatives and to hinder Congress ability to examine critically defense spending requests.

On February 7, under the auspices of the Coalition for a New Foreign and Military Policy, Senator MCGOVERN, Representative ROSENTHAL, and myself, a seminar was held to allow four distinguished experts to present alternative

views on the nature of the Soviet-United States military balance.

The participants were: Dr. Jeremy Stone, director of the Federation of American Scientists; Dr. Earl Ravenal, professor of American foreign policy at the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies; Arthur Macy Cox, a writer and consultant on foreign affairs who previously served in the State Department and the CIA; and Herbert Scoville, currently the secretary of the Arms Control Association. The thoughts and points of view of these gentlemen are ones all Members of Congress, the administration, and the public should seriously consider as we discuss the defense budget this year. I and several of my colleagues present the text of the seminar in this hope.

The text of the seminar follows:

PART I

Representative SCHROEDER. I appreciate so many of you coming and I appreciate you taking the time to begin what we think is a very important dialogue. As you know we really do have a chance to begin anew with a new administration.

We have heard of late all sorts of hysterical comments about the Russians are coming, the Russians are coming. So I guess one of the main reasons we're here is to find out whether we really should get a night light or whether there is another sign and try to open up a little bit more of a progressive debate as to what is going on.

We continually seem to get the worse case scenario. I'm hoping that the gentlemen who are with us today can give us some case other than the worse case, and see where we move from there.

I think this is an excellent program that's been set up and I want to thank the gentlemen who were here. We have Herbert Scoville, who has been active in this field since 1948. He's been the Technical Director of the Armed Forces Special Weapons Project. He's been assistant director and deputy director of the CIA, and he's been assistant director of the Arms Center and Disarmament Agency. He is currently the Secretary of the Arms Control Association. He has excellent credentials in this area.

We have Arthur Macy Cox who has served in the State Department; he's been with the CIA as a specialist on Soviet affairs. He was a senior fellow at the Brookings Institute and is now a writer and consultant on foreign affairs.

We have Dr. Earl Ravenal who was a systems analyst, Division Director in the office of the Secretary of Defense and he is currently a professor of American foreign policy at Johns Hopkins.

And we also have Jeremy Stone. He has been a fellow, a staff member, a professor at many institutions including Stanford, Harvard, Pomona College, the Hudson Institute and the Council on Foreign Relations. Since 1970, he's been the Director of the Federation of American Scientists.

I think these four gentlemen have excellent credentials. And I think what we'll do is just launch them rightaway and hopefully begin a dialogue that will put a little more light and a little less heat on the subject. I think we'll start with you Dr. Scoville.

Dr. SCOVILLE. We have heard an awful lot of words about the Soviet threat. So far we've seen a lot of smoke and what it is really for us to decide is whether there's really some fire there or whether this is a smoke screen to hide what the real facts are. I'd like today to very briefly look at a few of the facts and see if they in any way, justify all this rhetoric.

ric that we are hearing about the Soviet threat. I have looked at the strategic programs in former Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld's last posture statement and looked at what he said was the Soviet threat today and compared it with what he had said that threat would be a year ago.

And instead of finding that the threat is increasing and accelerating in its pace, one actually finds out that the threat is actually less than he predicted it would be a year ago.

For example, in the most important criteria of strategic strength, which is the total number of missile warheads and bombs, last year he predicted that the Soviet Union in a 12-month period would increase its force by a factor of a thousand. As it turned out, this year he now admits that in a period of 15 months instead of a year, they only added 800 to their total force loadings. In other words, the rate was 35 percent slower than he had predicted a year ago.

Furthermore, if you look at the total numbers, the Soviets now have 3,300 such warheads and bombs while the United States has 8,400. This somehow doesn't strike me as any real occasion for great new alarm.

The numbers on the actual number of MIRVed missiles has not been given in an unclassified form, however, you can infer what this is from these numbers because all of these increases are in the MIRVed missile program, and therefore you must assume that their MIRVed missiles are also behind schedule. Undoubtedly, the number of Soviet MIRVed missiles now is somewhat less than 200—the exact number is probably classified—while we have about a thousand. So again I don't think there's any question of who is superior in this category of weapons which is an extremely important one.

Next you look at the submarine missiles which is the second element of the triad and actually the most important element from a point of view of having a secure deterrent force. Last year Rumsfeld predicted that the Soviets would add 120 submarine-launched missiles to its force. Now he admits that during the past 15 months they only added 70. In other words, the rate is really less than half as fast as was predicted or estimated a year ago. Incidentally, in terms of totals now in existence, we have about 5,000 submarine launched missile warheads while the Soviets have 800. Somehow I can't get terribly alarmed about U.S. inferiority in that particular category.

Finally in the bomber area, one does not have quite such nice comparison of numbers because it's a big argument as to whether the Backfire is a true Soviet intercontinental bomber or not, since it can only reach targets in the United States on a one-way mission flying subsonically at high altitudes or on a two-way mission, also subsonically at high altitudes, if it is refueled. The Soviets have a vastly inferior refueling capability than that of the United States.

But even if you add in all the Backfires, as Secretary Rumsfeld does, the Soviet force is only 210 bombers most of which are old, while we have about 420. So again I don't feel any great fear about Soviet superiority in this area.

While those who have been crying Russian threat have therefore had a little trouble in finding this in the actual weapons system. And so during the last 6 months or so, we've heard of a new threat. And that's the Soviet civil defense capability. I'd find this almost laughable if it wasn't for the fact that so many people take it seriously. Somehow or other it's a very dangerous thing that now the Soviet Union has provided shelters for its leadership in the event of a nuclear conflict. In other words the leaders of the Soviet government now have shelters they can go to to protect themselves. I didn't get any great feeling that the United States was planning a nuclear first strike when we

dug these holes in the mountains of Maryland and Virginia and newer ones out in the Rockies. It's a very sound move if you want to have a deterrent force to try and protect your command in control.

The fact that you're providing that protection doesn't strike me as an indication that you are planning a first strike. I don't find this a very terrifying Soviet threat. They also have large numbers of civil defense manuals, and they have a large number of areas that have been set aside to mark the shelter areas. Well, our civil defense people have a lot of manuals, and if you look carefully you can find a lot of little signs saying shelter area, in our cities. But I don't think anybody in this country thinks we have a serious civil defense effort that would really accomplish anything in a real nuclear conflict. You've got to practice; you've got to train people; you've got to do all kinds of things, and these people who are crying civil defense can't find much evidence of this. This is the kind of thing you can't hide very easily because so many people have to be involved.

Then the final civil defense thing that everybody is worried about is the Soviets supposedly have plans to evacuate their civilians from their cities; have them march out to the countryside with shovels and dig themselves a little shelter and then the nuclear war goes on and then they come back into the cities and everything is going to be fine. Well I was involved in measuring nuclear weapons effects, and I just find this really ridiculous. One 15 megaton bomb out in the Pacific contaminated 5,000 square miles with lethal radioactive fallout. The only way to get protection from fallout is to be in underground or in heavy structures. Just digging yourself a foxhole might give you a little protection, but going out into the country is just the surest way in the world to expose yourself to fallout. So this kind of a tactic only will increase their casualties.

Now the people who are arguing this rationalize this on the fact that the United States will never detonate a bomb so as to produce fallout. We'd only set them off very high up in the air where they wouldn't produce casualties. Well if I was a Soviet planner, I don't think I would have that much reliance on the fact that we wouldn't use this tactic when we certainly have the capability. If our deterrent was being eroded, I doubt very much whether we wouldn't detonate our bombs close to the ground. Particularly since if you want to destroy hard military targets which the former administration was saying that it was an important military objective, you have to set them off close to the ground; you can't set them off high in the air. So I find this whole evacuation threat not a very serious one.

And then to sum it all up, the very concept that Soviet leaders would consciously launch a nuclear strike and accept the destruction of its cities, a large part of its industries, and a minimum of 20 million casualties in order to destroy the United States, I find incredible. What would they gain by destroying the United States, when they have essentially wiped out their civilization in order to do it. I find these kinds of threats that the Soviets are planning an attack are very unconvincing. I don't think they're building the weapons to give the indication that they are planning that kind of attack, and I don't think their civil defense program will support this kind of thesis either. That very briefly is my analysis of the strategic situation.

Dr. JEREMY STONE. My name is Jeremy Stone; I'm from the Federation of American Scientists. I want to compliment what Pete Scoville has told you by going into slightly greater detail on both the strategic balance and the civil defense program. I share the kind of sentiments he's expressed.

I want to say at the outset that I think one

should be very vigilant about the Russians because in my experience things have always gotten worse in the 15 years I've been studying this problem. I'm not here to suggest to you that the Soviet arms build-up won't continue or that they might not for reasons I could describe—continue to go in for more and more civil defense. Both things are entirely possible and one should worry about them.

We see in our own political situation and in the budgets which come before you here, all kinds of unholy things that go on in the spending of money which never have been predicted on a prior basis. Our coalitions are held together by free discussion and by particular desires in this free market place of ideas. The Russians don't have that problem. They do have, in theory, a sound control from the center of what they do. But they have all of these coalition problems that which they are strongly imbued from secrecy and ideological virginity. There isn't much that they can do that would really surprise me in retrospect and I think therefore its worth considering all these things very seriously.

But having said that, it is certainly the tendency in America to view with greater alarm Soviet developments than they deserve and also to apply to them a double standard in assessing what the Russians sometimes viewing with great alarm while discounting entirely the fact that we are doing the same or even greater things. To give examples of that, I'd like to point to the question of hard target kill capability. Dr. Scoville talked about who has more in all these categories. That's the rhetoric in which the arms race is usually discussed. Of course it has very little to do with anything strategic.

At the moment the main thing of relevance in this strategic arena are two salient facts. One, no one sees any way of destroying our missile firing submarines. Therefore, for the worst possible case we are prepared with those alone to launch 4,000 or 5,000 nuclear warheads at the Soviet target system. If those were aimed at cities and towns in the Soviet Union, you would be destroying all of the towns down to towns of 5 to 10,000 population. That may be Plains but I think its probably Americus, Georgia. It would mean that whether the people were in those cities or not, virtually all of the shelter in the Soviet Union would be destroyed. If they were to be evacuated out beyond those cities and towns, they would have to be in rural areas where there is no place to put them. The one salient fact is this Polaris force whose invulnerability has not been successfully challenged or even I think suggested.

Now the other salient factor in this strategic situation is that the land-based missiles on the two sides are becoming vulnerable to the land-based missiles on the other side. That is, if all we had were land-based missiles on the two sides, and if that's all they had, we would be quite nervous because we would see that on paper, at least, the time is coming when we will be able to destroy their land-based missiles on paper and they will be able to destroy our land-based missiles on paper. So therefore if there were only those land-based missiles, each side would be especially worried about its deterrent. But because it has the sea-based forces it's not so worried, but still nervous. Now in our case when we talk about this, and you can see this in Secretary Schlesinger's testimony of a few years ago, he says "well we can't destroy all of their land-based missiles, and we'll never be able to destroy flat out all of those 1,500 and therefore they don't have to worry, they'll always have some left."

This is not the criterion, however, that we are implying when considering the vulnerability of our land-based missiles. There

we apply different criteria and we say, well if they could destroy more of our missiles, then would we be up in the destruction, then we're in trouble.

Now even if you want to worry about that kind of scenario, the possibility that there might be a limited but strategic nuclear war between the land-based missiles of the two sides, and that someone might say ha, ha, I destroyed all of your thousand land bases with 500 of mine, and I've got 500 left in reserve, to a country that has the bombers, we have 250 of them and these 4,000 or 5,000 nuclear warheads of submarines. It strikes me as extremely implausible. But even if you want to worry about that, the thing that has been ignored in the present debate is that we are about to bolt into an enormous lead over the Soviet Union in this very criterion about which so much concern has been expressed.

THE SOVIET-UNITED STATES MILITARY BALANCE—PART II

HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I join my distinguished colleague PAT SCHROEDER in continuing the presentation of the text of the February 7 seminar on the Soviet-United States military balance.

Part II of the text follows:

PART II

Dr. STONE. The concern is usually expressed by saying, if the Russians have big missiles and the throw weight in those big missiles will produce plenty of warheads, all those MIRVed warheads will be able to destroy our land based missiles. But the fact of the matter is that throw weight is not the relevant consideration any more because accuracy has become much more important. When accuracies reach about a tenth of a nautical mile, everybody's got plenty of throw weight, and if you read the missile daily reports, see that they are predicting for the MK 12A warhead that it will have 600 foot accuracy, which is precisely 1/10 of a mile. And if you look at the Rumsfeld posture statement, on page 125, you will see that the end of fiscal 1978, an enormous increase in our hard target kill capability will arise as a result of installation of the guidance system for this warhead, and of the warhead itself. The warhead will double the yield of the Minuteman III missile and guidance will increase its accuracy by about a factor of 2.

We will leap not only into a lead over the Russians in hard target kill capability but, according to these official projections, we will have a 5-year lead. And we will not only have a lead in this category, but we will be in a position with that lead to destroy, at least on paper, substantial numbers of Soviet land-based missiles. In other words it won't just be a lead in a numbers game. It will be a lead of strategic significance if you worry about land based missiles being destroyed.

The kind of thing we are talking about is this. On half of our land based missile force with these new warheads with this new accuracy, if you believe the reports of the press, that half of the land based missile force alone will be able to fire one warhead at each of the Soviet land based missiles and that one warhead will have by itself a high probability of destroying that missile.

Of course, some of these won't go off reliably and we might, if we wanted to, and

if our procedure permitted it, fire another missile into place when we saw it did go off reliably. I'm not sure exactly how well we could do this. This is called "shoot-look-shoot." You see you shoot and then you look to see if it's reliable, then you shoot again. I don't know how reliably we could do that operation but I know the Russians must be worrying about it because this same posture statement says that in 25 minutes we can retarget our land based missiles now over and above the pre-positioned target in the missiles.

So the point I want to make to you is that the Soviets who have a much greater percentage of their strategic forces in their land based missile force, are simultaneously in a much tougher situation with regard to this strategic trend than we are. They've got more of their eggs in the land based missile force and we are attacking more effectively those same eggs.

If you want to know who is spurring this counter-force, hard target kill capability race, it should be said that while both sides have a large measure of guilt in this problem, and while the whole thing is a kind of race of momentum on the two sides, nevertheless, we are, as usual, ahead.

Now in the civil defense realm, I think the concern about Soviet civil defense rests upon, first, the fact that the Russians have for a long time been more interested in civil defense than we are. It was charged that for 20 years they were spending a billion dollars a year on civil defense. This is more than we spend, and it's probably true that they were for those 20 years spending that billion dollars a year. However, a billion dollars a year is \$4 a person for the Russians. And \$4 a person is a very standard rate of spending for European countries that have suffered through wars. It's the rate of spending in West Germany, it's the rate of spending of Swedes and the Swiss spend \$50 per person on civil defense. So that in itself is not a very significant factor.

It is charged that in 1972 the Russians spurred up their civil defense program. It's not clear whether this is true or not. But if it's true, it could be easily explained by the fact that in 1972, we signed with the Russians an anti-ballistic missile treaty in which we both agreed not to defend our cities. I consider it entirely plausible, the Defense Minister in Russia said to the Polit Bureau, if you're going to force us to sign this treaty to forego defending our cities with anti-ballistic missiles, we have to do something, step up something to show some improvement in the capability of protecting people. This seems to be especially plausible because their main problem at the moment in terms of a likely war, I believe is the Chinese threat. They have a 2,000 mile border with the Chinese and a real chance of war against them. And against the Chinese, a civil defense program might look much better than it looks against the Americans.

There is an exact analogy between our interest in a thick ABM system against the Chinese when we had also decided a thick ABM system against the Russians was hopeless. So they may be caught up in this and they may therefore continue to spend more money and do more things in civil defense. I don't preclude it; I don't think there's too much evidence for it now in the public domain.

Let's assume they did, the question, is what would be the result? Now there are two possibilities at this program. One possibility is that they would use it against us and the other possibility is that they would threaten to use it against us. The first question of using it against us is the Strangeloveian scenario that Dr. Scoville referred to. Could they evacuate the cities? And then just fire and destroy the Americans and try to rebuild all these cities.

This is in fact being charged by some engineers in Boeing who have done a study in which they argue the Russians could within 15 years, even if they lost half the population and, get back to the same gross national product they had before. Of course if they lose half the population and they get back to the same gross national product in 15 years, they double the GNP per capita in 15 years, which I think they could do without a war and with all their cities.

Leaving aside the fact that this study seems to have been done by economic imbeciles who have produced these kinds of curbs. I think one can address this question very precisely, and I hope it will be done in the future still more precisely to show how difficult it would be for the Russians to do anything like this.

For example, if they do this in the Spring, then they have the whole Summer to recuperate and try to get some shelter before the Winter comes. But then they have no harvest. If they do it in the Fall, they could bring in the harvest, but then they would have no shelter—and they would not survive the Winter. After the attack they will discover that there will be plagues of famine because insects are more resistant to radiation than are mammals or birds, so you are going to have a completely different ecology. The ozone layer will be blown to bits. It won't be clear that people can stay outdoors very long because of the sunburn they would get with the hole blown in the ozone layer predicted by the National Academy of Sciences. There are a whole lot of problems over and above what immediate fatalities would be if you spread people uniformly over the Soviet landscape, which in fact you can't do anyway.

I think the argument about Soviet Civil Defense has been done in a very narrow and the calculation has been done in a very amateurish way. And I think it is precisely because no one has looked at this in a long time that the studies were done so badly.

But you may say, as even the Civil Defense proponents and alarmists do say, "Well, what if they wouldn't use it against us, but what if they threaten us with it, what if they have evacuated those cities and said, 'Look, we can kill more of you than you can kill of us, at least immediately.'" How about that? Well, I think one important thing to say about that is that it cannot be done more than once. That is, if the person is deterred from actually firing, it is an important, and not a sardonic comment, to say that he could not do it more than once. By that I mean, if they threatened us in ambassadorial contacts, or begin to evacuate their cities, there is no question that America would bolt into a program of further arms procurement and perhaps Civil Defense programs too, that would make it absolutely clear that no Russian would survive a future nuclear war.

We have it within our power to do that, the only question is—whether we are going to do that. It is very similar to the situation you might find if you met somebody with a knife and he pulls a knife on you. If you knew he was deterred from using it—it is an important and relevant thing to say that that guy would never pull that knife on you twice. You'd never give him a chance to do it. I think the attack can't be carried out because it is not a successful maneuver for many, many reasons and it can't be threatened because it is so much outside the reasonable range that it would just provoke another cold war and arms race to no end. There is not on the scene any political crisis to which such a threat would be relevant. The Civil Defense alarm is vastly exaggerated.

Finally, if asking what we should do, I want to pose to you a certain moral question that this whole Civil Defense alarm really

raises for all of us. We have talked in the past about the mutual assured destruction as a policy. In fact, it was never our policy. The policy always was unacceptable damage. We were saying in the past, we are going to maintain the ability to destroy a certain number of Russians and a certain amount of industrial capability so as to deter them from things we think against our interest. That policy is now threatened by some who'd like to turn it into real mutual assured destruction.

In other words, if you take seriously this Civil Defense flop and you think the relevant thing is not to deter them by threatening unacceptable damage but instead to show that no matter what the scenario is, more Americans will survive than Russians—that even if there are only three people left, two of them will be Americans and only one Russian. If you take that view, and you try to achieve that in every scenario, I can tell you as a mathematician that you will have to continually increase the number of Russians that you can destroy as their weapon capability goes up and as you consider the worse scenarios from your point of view.

So we're faced with the possibility that we might be forced in America through these alarms about Soviet Civil Defense to design a policy which is really genocidal—not just a policy that said it was going to be mutual assured destruction, but one that was really genocidal.

In this connection, the Russians are right in thinking, if they do, some will survive this war. Nuclear war is not going to destroy every last person and it is not insane to have Civil Defense procedures on a prudential basis. It is not crazy to have a fall-out shelter program in America; you may be for or against it, but it is not crazy. The point I want to make is that if we are going to view Civil Defense as a threat to us, we are going to be forced to go well beyond even the inhumanity of the posture we've designed. I think we should not do it lightly. If in fact, Soviet Civil Defense is not really a threat to us, we ought not automatically bolt to a program of putting radioactive cobalt bomb casings on our bombs, or whatever else we might decide to make sure that everybody died. That is what this thing could lead to in the end. There is no doubt in my mind that it would eventually be done to us.

With this connection, what we are risking today by exaggerating the Soviet threat is what we've been risking all this time over the last twenty years. Exaggeration of a threat has led in the end to a higher threat against our own security and to a diminution of the security of our Republic.

Dr. ARTHUR MACY COX. I am Arthur Cox. I am going to talk about the problems of military power in Central Europe. I am going to talk about the growing propaganda that has developed, especially in the last year, about the Soviet threat in Central Europe and some of the facts that I haven't seen given sufficient attention.

One is that we hear about the growing threat of war in Central Europe from the Soviet position and the supposed growth of Soviet forces. Actually, the Soviet's ground forces now are more than 50% directed at China. The Soviets have 44 divisions on the Chinese borders and 31 divisions facing NATO. They have more backup divisions facing China in the interior Soviet Union than they do facing NATO.

But a very important aspect of the recent concern about Soviet buildups, so called buildups in Central Europe has been what the last two posture statements of the Pentagon have referred to as the Blitzkrieg potential of Soviet forces and the threat of a central thrust forward all the way to the Channel which could not be adequately deterred by NATO forces.

This argument of the Soviet Blitzkrieg potential I have never seen seriously developed in any of the literature in the United States. The only place where I have seen some serious analysis of a threat in Central Europe is in the Brookings Setting National Priorities For The Next Ten Years, that came out this Fall and Brookings has modified its position. Last year, Brookings talked about a possibility of a 15-billion dollar cut in our defense spending. Now they have modified that and indicate that they do not think we can cut more than 5-billion. The reason is that they too talk about a threat in Central Europe—the growing threat. The analysis set forth by Henry Owen, principal author, Director of International Studies of Brookings, though he says he does not see any real possibility of a Soviet aggressive move, nevertheless, he says, "the chances of this occurring might be greater if Soviet leaders were already facing a violent challenge in Eastern Europe, in this event they might conclude that a Soviet domination in an Eastern Europe constantly exposed to the contagion of Western pluralism and influence would be difficult to preserve. That they might act to neutralize Western Europe or accept the prospect of continuing troubles in the East."

Well, that is the principal argument for justifying a buildup in NATO, a buildup in Central European force structures. I think that is one of the most preposterous estimates of Soviet intentions and Soviet capabilities that I have read anywhere. And yet, I have not seen this challenged in the press yet—this Brookings analysis and the change in their estimate of possible defense cuts has been given rather favorable commentary in the press. To think that the Soviets, threatened by resistance in Eastern Europe, would risk a strike into Central Europe and Germany is, to me, an act of suicide that the Soviets and their entire history have never manifested.

Clearly, the Soviets are very concerned about the quicksand that they live on in Eastern Europe. They are a hated occupier in East Germany, Poland and Czechoslovakia. They have four divisions in Hungary—they have had them every since 1956, when the Hungarian uprising took place. But the forces they have in Hungary are certainly not going to be available for any so-called blitzkrieg.

The forces they have in East Germany, Poland and Czechoslovakia are 27 divisions. There are 27 other divisions in the Warsaw Pact which the Soviets have very good reasons to doubt the reliability of. In 1968 when the Soviet Union moved 200 thousand men into Czechoslovakia, they had very good intelligence that the Czech military leadership was extraordinary risky. There is a long history of hatred of the Soviets in Eastern and Central Europe and just to look at the Iron Curtain and the Berlin Wall—why are they there? They are there to keep people in, they are to keep people from leaving. If there were a war, the Soviets know that there would be a sudden movement outward, there would be shots in the back. All of the intelligence that I have seen, and I used to be in CIA, demonstrates that the Soviets are extraordinary worried about maintaining their position in Eastern Europe. To think that a military force in such a circumstance would strike outward into West Germany, which now has the finest military force in all of Europe, including the Soviets and the United States, the Germans have built an incredible military structure, is to me the strangest of logic.

Yet in briefings to Congress in the last several months, and I think Congresswoman Schroeder would testify to this, the Pentagon has been telling of extraordinary dangers, the extraordinary need to build up forces because of this potential thrust of the Soviets who, by the way, are facing in the Chinese,

what they say is their number one threat, and which their military forces pointing in that direction demonstrate that that is their view. Why on earth they would ever contemplate a thrust into Western Europe is beyond imagination.

Yet I have not seen what I have just been saying put out into the press. I have not seen constant challenge to this nonsense that has been perpetrated of this incredible threat. The Soviets have not increased their divisions in Central Europe since the Czech coup. They did put in 200,000 men at that time, and they have stayed. They have 31 divisions; 4 in Hungary, 27 remaining. They have put in much more effective weapons, just as we have, year by year. As the weapons come off the assembly line, they go into the forces. This is standard military practice.

But my belief is that we should keep our eye on the ball and move now to take the opportunity to negotiate a reduction of forces in Central Europe.

There is an opportunity; the Soviets are interested in it, have put it on the line, and, for those of you who haven't seen it, you might want to look at a piece I had in the Washington Post, November 21, called "Germany, Key to Europe Troop Cuts". In that piece, I talk about the importance of West Germany as the need on all sides: the balancing of West Germany forces before we will get motion in the East/West negotiations.

Dr. EARL RAVENAL. My name is Earl Ravenal. I was in the Pentagon for several years in the late 1960s and am now teaching American foreign policy.

I am not going to try to recapitulate parts of the excellent and very quantitative presentations that have preceded.

I want to try to, however, open up the debate a little bit by admitting the possibility that certain arguments that have been brought up by the other side, so to speak, the people who are exaggerating the threat, while I do not share those arguments, might be formidable enough to take account of. We are all here to discuss ways of formulating counter-arguments and counterproposals to the kinds of things we are hearing these days. So I think that, in a way, we have to, however grudgingly, begin by giving a little bit of, not credence, but weight and take seriously some of the, perhaps, distorted logic and the arguments that are being put forward by the new Hawks mostly in order to try to devise understandable and convincing counterarguments.

The arguments of the last ten years, fifteen, twenty years, that some of us are familiar with, I don't think are sufficiently weighty these days. We have to be very careful about the kinds of argumentation, kinds of strategies that we use in countering these new arguments. In other words, what I am saying is that in our debating tactics we probably need a second line of defense, a kind of "what if" argument. I want to make it clear that I thoroughly subscribe to the estimates that have been put forward today, and I am not worried about the so-called Russian threat. The numbers that we've heard and the estimates of Soviet potentialities and intentions are very convincing, but I think that we need a second line of defense, a sort of "what if" argument. And that's the kind of consideration that I want to put forward in the next couple of minutes.

Although I don't believe in worst cases at all, I think that our military organizations are being paid to hedge against worse-than-we-think cases. So really, we ought to direct our attention to answering arguments about not what they are most likely to do, but what they might do in certain crisis situations, and also what they could do if they set their minds to it. These are sort of different forms of the old suggestions of intentions and capabilities.

And I think that the way to deal with these questions, these new questions that have been brought up about Soviet inten-

tions and capabilities, is really to transcend these considerations. Because when you talk about threats that they might mount, that they might have the intention of mounting, the question is, threats to what, with regard to what American capabilities. American capabilities to do what in the world? Do what in certain military theaters?

When we look at those kinds of considerations, first of all with regard to the strategic balance, we come to the conclusion that, whether or not the numbers that are being put forward by the new Hawks are convincing, the point is, the numbers really don't matter at all. It's not the numbers that matter, the question is the stability of the strategic balance. Especially in crisis. And there probably will be some within the life of this present Administration. It is not even Soviet intentions, as such, that matter. Again it's the stability of the strategic balance.

And the kinds of things that we have to consider are first of all is what we want to do with our forces, our military forces, and secondly, what the other side can do to our forces, whatever their intentions might be. In other words, the question is not one of inferiority.

THE SOVIET-UNITED STATES MILITARY BALANCE—PART III

HON. BOB CARR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. CARR. Mr. Speaker, I join my distinguished colleagues, PAT SCHROEDER and RON DELLUMS, in continuing the presentation of the text of the February 7 seminar on the Soviet-United States military balance.

Part III of the text follows:

PART III

Dr. RAVENAL. Therefore the arguments that are put forward to emphasize American superiority in certain categories, particularly of strategic arms, are very well taken arguments, but they're not essentially the point. We could be, in certain categories, technically inferior, and it wouldn't make very much difference.

The question is always the relevance of these numbers to the question of what we intend to do with our military forces. Because if we intend to do certain things with our military forces, such as fight limited wars, conceivably we'll never have enough missiles to accomplish these purposes. And the whole question of numbers becomes very open-ended. Whereas if we restrict ourselves to certain finite and limited kinds of intentions and uses of our nuclear forces, particularly, and I'm going to mention later on, our conventional forces, too, then we already have more than enough. And that becomes a sufficient answer to the debate.

I think that we can conceive, without too much harm, that the Soviets technically could be on the road to threatening our missiles, particularly our fixed land-based missiles, and with this I agree with some of the comments that have been made. But the question, of course, is what to do about this technological fact. Of course, this might not be the case today, but it's inconceivable that technological drift will not, on the part of the Soviets, give them increasing accuracies as the years go by, and as Jeremy Stone mentioned, accuracy is the key to the ability to knock out fixed targets. Instead of holding on to a shrinking argumentative position, that is, that the Soviets cannot at this point threaten a large percentage for fixed land-based missile force, perhaps it

would not do any great amount of harm to concede that point and to get on with the question of what, if anything, we ought to do about this, which is what the payoff question is.

And the reason that this question of what to do about it all is urgent and current, is because on the drawing boards and in train, and even with this present Administration, are some very expensive and possibly destabilizing proposals, in all categories of strategic arms, particularly the MX, that is, the replacement of mobile or multiple basing point replacing our present fixed land based missiles, not to speak of the B-1 and the Trident. And those decisions are going to have to be made very early in this Administration. In fact, they are being made now, and the basic stance of this Administration toward all of these programs is in the process of being determined.

If we're going to have a Congressional debate, or a national debate, about the so-called Soviet threat, the debate should be held in terms of the somewhat larger question, the real fundamental underlying function of what we want to do, what we propose to do in the world with our military forces.

We could actually reinsure our strategic stability for decades at lower levels of deployment and lower levels of spending. I don't intend now to put forward the details of such a proposal, but one way of doing this would be simply to do away with our fixed land-based missiles if the conviction of our military and intelligence people comes to be that they are becoming increasingly vulnerable to an accurate Soviet placement of missiles. And we could safely, even move to a diad of forces. We don't need all the redundancy that is built into the present triad. And if it came to a choice between it spending 30 or 50 billion dollars on a fleet of mobile missiles, the MX, or doing away entirely with our land-based missiles over a period of time, in an orderly way, then I think the latter is the direction in which we could go.

So the irony of the whole debate these days is that even if we were to concede that the Soviets now have the capability to threaten our missile force, we could actually remedy that situation at lower levels of deployment, lower levels of spending, rather than higher.

But I think that this also tends to illustrate, again, that the question is not the numbers game, it's not in any index, doesn't matter what it is, warheads deliverable, effective megatonnage, throw-weight launchers, or what have you. None of those measures, within extremely wide limits, mean anything. The logic of the threat and the logic of an exchange of nuclear missiles consists in the types of incentives that we create or that we discourage on the part of our adversaries ever to mount a preemptive or first strike nuclear attack upon ourselves. In designing the forces that we have in the future, creating negative incentives for the Soviets to do any such thing should be our primary concern, and this is not necessarily an expensive business, although we have to be careful about what kinds of moves we make.

Now if we were to do away actually with one leg of the triad, we would, in fact, save from 5 to 7 billion dollars a year, something on that order, depending upon the precise way in which we did this, and after necessary shifts were made to insure that we had sufficient capabilities in our other types of nuclear forces. We should not regard the strategic nuclear part of our defense budget as a rich source of budgetary savings. There is a very widespread misapprehension on the part of many of us that it is the strategic arms race that is costing all the money and that this provides the impetus for large real annual increases that we have been experiencing, and will continue to experience, un-

fortunately, it seems, in the next year or two, at least, in our overall defense budget.

In point of fact, out of about 123 billion dollars which might well be spent or requested in total authorizations next fiscal year, 1978, about 80% represents general purpose forces, and only 20%, about 25 billion dollars, including all overheads, represent the strategic arms budget. So if our concern shifts for a moment to the size of the defense budget, then the place that we ought to be looking for substantial savings and the place where we have to consider seriously the kinds of moves we would have to make to get those savings, would be in the conventional or the general force area, where, in point of fact, some 96 or 98 billion dollars are going to be spent in fiscal year 1978.

Now there are some further apprehensions about general purpose forces that come out of the rhetoric of the struggles of the last ten or fifteen years. We've become used to equating the large general purpose forces that the United States maintains around the world in terms of some kind of imperialist reach, some kind of urge to dominate. That bit of rhetoric, although it succeeded in generating a great deal of useful sentiment, however, is not strictly true. We must get our thinking straight on the subject of general purposes forces and what they cost and what they are, and where we keep them.

The Third World has nothing to do with the size of our general purpose forces. And they have nothing to do with any dreams of counterrevolution or opposing revolutionary movements or even autonomous movements in various countries. We could conduct a very useful discussion about American foreign policy in these Third World areas, but that has very little to do with the size of our general purpose forces.

Those general purpose forces are kept for the major contingencies that our present and most recent national leadership have felt might occur. And those, of course, are primarily in Europe. Europe costs about 55 billion dollars a year as a matter of American foreign policy concern. That is probably the highest number anybody here would want to put forward, and it is certainly higher than most of the numbers that we have heard from other quarters. But if you analyze and allocate all portions of the defense budget to their ultimate purpose, you will find Europe for 1978 is costing the United States about 55 billion dollars.

Now I hasten to say that that does not tell anyone what we ought to do about this, but it's well to keep these figures in mind. Asia, despite the withdrawals from Viet Nam, still costs 25 or 26 billion dollars a year. So I think that if we want to orient ourselves to the question of savings in the defense budget, a serious debate has to occur about our major commitments and, I would suggest—and this is entirely against the tide—about Soviet conventional threats.

We should probably still tackle the question of placing limits on the claims of our allies to our military support. Now, in that regard, and I'll finish on this note, the recent trip of Vice President Mondale to Europe was certainly regarded as heartwarming and reassuring by our allies. It achieved its purpose. But I would like to suggest that there is a price to pay for this kind of rhetoric. It's a price we're already paying and that price will grow. And a large part of that price is yet to be paid. I think that we have to keep those considerations very firmly in mind in looking at the total impact of our military forces on our national life.

Representative SCHROEDER. Thank you all very much. I appreciate the panelists trying to be brief in this very, very difficult area. One thing that I might point out in the general forces area and that all of you might be interested in watching here on the Hill, is the shipbuilding budget which is a very

large portion of the general forces in the weapons that we have to procure, because they're very expensive weapons.

One of the interesting things going on in the Hill is the suit that Les Aspin has and some of you might want to monitor it. In 1970 when Admiral Zumwalt was the CNO and the Russians were building up their fleet, they declassified the intelligence that we had on the Russian fleet, so that we knew what kind of ships they were building, and projecting to build, and they were laid out by classification. This year, the Russians really have cut back their shipbuilding, which is very interesting, and this year we can't get them to declassify the number of ships, so that we know that there are 231 surface ships, but we are unable to get declassified how many of those are frigates, and how many of those are destroyers, and so forth and so on.

Now Les Aspin has a Freedom of Information suit going, saying, How come it could be declassified when they were going up, but you can't declassify it when it's coming down. It's one of the fascinating things going on that you might want to monitor in your offices.

We'll open it up for questions for about 20 minutes.

Q. Mr. Cox, how were you estimating that West Germany has the finest military force in Western Europe and how much do they have?

Cox. The West Germans have now about a million men, a reserve force that can be called up in 48 hours. Their training is very effective, their equipment is as good as U.S. forces, but our military, and other military that I've talked to, NATO commanders, maintain that they have a readiness that is better than U.S. forces.

Q. I understand that we have about 110 ships being built that we never hear about.

SCHROEDER. We have an awful lot of ships in the pipeline that haven't come out the other end. Our shipbuilding industry is not one of the most efficient, to put it very, very mildly. That is one of the things that comes out of here, how many ships we have paid for versus how many ships we have had delivered, and that, I don't know that the number is exactly—110—I'd have to recheck that. There are an awful lot of ships that the American taxpayers have paid for but have never seen. We can only hope that someday we will see them.

SCOVILLE. One of the problems here is also not the numbers of ships, but the kind of ships. The U.S. shipbuilding program has been aimed to a large extent at very large, very expensive, and, particularly, to a large number of nuclear powered ships. This runs the bill up very, very fast. It might account for one reason why we are behind schedule. We might need more ships but it's not clear that we need more big ones. And I guess there is a step in the right direction, at least with the stopping of the large nuclear carrier program this year, but there still is an awful lot in there.

Q. Dr. Ravenal, you were saying before that thinking about these issues in terms of what our contentions were, in terms of what we want to do with our military forces. Could you be more specific about that in determining what force levels are necessary?

RAVENAL. Well, let me start by relating that question of the relevance of our own intentions to the size of our forces to the question that was asked before about ships being built. The United States Navy would like to reverse the decline in shipbuilding and the size of the number of principal vessels, combat vessels in the Navy, from about probably about 480 at this point to about 600. Well, 600 might not be enough, it might be too many, and it might be just about right, but the question is what are we supposed to be doing with our Navy in the world? That is the question that has to be debated.

There are a lot of misapprehensions about the uses of our Navy. But it is true that a large part of our surface naval forces and even attack submarines are devoted to the principal task of reinforcing and resupplying our forces in Europe in the event of a fairly extended conventional conflict in Europe. The basic question, therefore, about the size of our navy and whether 485 ships is enough or whether we need 600 or more, and what types of ships we ought to have, has to do with whether we intend to fight an intermediate lengthy conventional war in Europe. Whichever other direction we might go in, whether there should be a tactical nuclear defense, which I don't happen to think there should be, or whether there should be some kind of fall-back strategy.

The point is that these are the kinds of questions, what we're going to do with our force is quite adequate with the existing have to be ironed out in terms of the kinds of commitments that we continue to undertake. This is why I mentioned Vice President Mondale's trip. Because rhetoric is all very well to pacify European fears and to satisfy their demands for American reassurance of American protection. But there is a very serious price that has to be paid for this.

Q. Dr. Scoville, what is the significance of the minimum deterrence concept which President Carter is ordering the Pentagon to study?

SCOVILLE. I think it's a very encouraging sign. All of us, and I include myself, have far too long been engaged in the rhetoric of balancing off 8 or 9 thousand warheads versus 8,000 or 9,000 Soviet warheads. It's all really nonsense. That kind of war is just absolutely ridiculous. It's time we did get back to thinking about small, minimum deterrent forces.

However, having said that, politically it is not going to be that easy to get there, but at least it's an encouraging thing that we are thinking about it for the first time in many, many years. It is a very useful step forward.

Could I just comment on one other thing in connection with these counterforce weapons, and I'd just like to strongly agree that these are the really dangerous kinds of weapons. Some weapons you just waste a lot of money on, but things that make nuclear war more likely, like the MX and the Mark 12A warhead, which give counterforce capabilities, don't provide security, they just increase the risk that we're all going to be blown up one of these days. Those are the programs that don't look at the dollars as much as what they do, it is a very important criteria.

Q. Paul Mintz's latest idea is to have 3,000 deliverable megatons to combat Soviet civil defense. If we did that, what would be the fallout impact on the American people if those dirty and radioactive megatonnage were ever delivered?

SCOVILLE. Well, unfortunately, I don't think you've got a very good argument there. They probably wouldn't do all that much. There probably would be effects, and you would have some serious fallout in this country, I'm sure, but not in the sense that it would produce immediate casualties. It would probably produce longer term effects. I think that there are better arguments against Paul Mintz's plan than that one, I think, I don't think that you could probably argue that we're killing ourselves, in order to destroy the Russians.

There is no question that 3,000 megatons would make an awful mess of the Soviet Union as far as fallout. Actually, our present forces can already do that. We have plenty of megatonnage to make population casualties in the Soviet Union very, very large if that was our objective that we wanted to carry out. This is one reason why this whole civil defense nonsense really doesn't make any sense as far as spoiling our deterrent.

THE SOVIET-UNITED STATES MILITARY BALANCE—PART IV

HON. THOMAS J. DOWNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues in adding to the text of the February 7 seminar on United States-Soviet military balance, a question which has important policy implications.

Part IV of the text follows:

PART IV

Q. In view of the current situation, the current national policy that is beginning in respect to NATO and to Europe, how can one rationalize the cutbacks of conventional forces with respect to the fact that so little is spent on preparedness?

Dr. RAVENAL. That outlines two possible interpretations of what the problem is. How can we even think about making cuts in our conventional forces in the current climate could be a political question, and I would agree on the conventional side with what Pete Scoville said on the question of reducing our missile forces to a small finite number. That is a very difficult political problem these days. As far as the other interpretation is concerned, whether we can even objectively think of reducing our forces in Europe, or in what other areas you might have in mind, but Europe is certainly the principal one. There is room for certain unilateral cuts in our forces. This is swimming against the political tide these days, but I think that it is no less valid to say that we can do it now than it was 4 or 5 years ago when it seemed to be much more popular and had a lot more political appeal. We could well ask what has happened in the meantime in the climate of opinion and why it is that all sorts of technical expertise on one side of the issue has somehow overwhelmed and overawed all the others. We have to recover our ability to do analysis. Far from having to reinforce our conventional forces expensively, which seems to be part of the program that is being urged upon us in this present Administration, I think that we could actually accomplish some of the cuts that various prominent members of Congress had tried to bring about over the last 5, 6, and 7 years.

Mr. STONE. I'd like to add something to the previous question that Pete Scoville was answering about the civil defense problem. As I tried to explain, the Russians are deterred from using this civil defense against us, and I think deterred from threatening this civil defense against us, for the different reasons I described: deterred from threatening because it could only be done once; and deterred from using it because it couldn't be used.

But the real cost of this alarm about Soviet civil defense is going to be to undermine the hopes that President Carter had for some kind of minimum deterrent program. Because it is all very easy for us to answer this civil defense alarm by saying, we have thousands of warheads and we've got three arms of our deterrent, and it is easy and in some ways opportunistic to answer the objections by explaining what enormous quantities of what are colloquially called "overkill" exists.

But if you want to turn to reducing this and you discover that you have inadvertently acquiesced in the notion that you need thousands of megatons with which to destroy the other side, then you will have problems to getting down to a sensible level. So the real danger of this alarm is not that it will panic Harold Brown into buying new

heavy megaton weapons that he wouldn't otherwise have bought. He's too sensible for that. He has already shown that in his statements. But it tends to put a higher floor under what we're doing than would have been before.

In the long run, I think the cost of this might be real cost to the human species. I want to point out that when the National Academy of Sciences did a study on what ten thousand megatons would do to the human race, they summarized it very badly. They concluded that they had no clear evidence that every single person would be killed by such a war. But if you looked at what in fact they said in the backup studies, there were massive uncertainties in many different areas about what would happen if so many thousands of megatons would go off. While they couldn't prove, because I don't think science can be expected to prove, that surely some single act would so perturb the climate or the ozone or the ecology as to kill the very last person, I can assure you they cannot prove the opposite either.

One of the most important reasons to bring the deterrent down to the levels we thought adequate in past years is to protect the species against the possibility that a nuclear war might just occur and leave not just the industrial world in ruins but the planet in smithereens.

Q. President Carter has made good statements about reducing nuclear weapons, but there is difficulty facing Paul Warnke in his nomination to be Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. Could you discuss this opposition?

STONE. I can say one thing that might be of interest. I think it is generally believed around Washington that there is no better champion of defense and arms control policy than Paul Warnke. Even opponents of his nomination, or those who have expressed some doubt, are, as a result of background conversations I've had, really irked by the fact that as the Evans and Novak column reported the other day, the right wing of the Democratic Party, the more Hawkish wing of the strategic analysts, have not gotten important positions in this Administration. It's turned out that President Carter has favored the Paul Warnkes over the Paul Mintzes. And this has been widely advertised in the papers. Those who are concerned about this trend, feel that their opportunity about making a point about what future arms control policy should be is to jump in on the Warnke nomination to see what they could do to express their view on that.

But as one who has read the entire set of past statements that Mr. Warnke has made, I've read them over the weekend—a whole stack of them—I can tell you that it is very difficult to make of them anything but a very sensible, humane and vigilant foreign and defense policy. I think he will be confirmed. By what margin I am not sure. But in any case, I think that the real action is not against him, but against the possibility that President Carter may try to get real deductions.

Q. Is Carter trying to save money or is he just trying to save money on nuclear weapons?

SCOVILLE. I think he really believes it's dangerous.

Q. Is there money to be saved?

SCOVILLE. Well, there's money to be saved. In fact, in that respect, I don't quite agree with Earl Ravenal. I am not quite prepared to say you can't make real savings in strategic weapons as well. This year's budget calls for about 7 billion dollars on new strategic weapons. I can go through that list and I'm sure our security would be better than if we saved 2 billion dollars. And that's not chicken feed.

RAVENAL. I thoroughly agree with you. I was saying that if just proportionably even

what is added to the defense budget every 12-13 billion dollars added every year, what can be saved even through the most well-placed and meticulous excisions of surgery on the strategic side is, unfortunately, going to be eaten up by months of inflation.

STONE. If I could add to it what my senior has just said. The real money to be saved is not in the money that could come out of the strategic force budget. 30 billion dollars could be saved if, in fact, we find through reductions of land based missiles, that it isn't necessary to go forward with the MX missile. Which I think, by the way, is unnecessary to do in any case because it would be counterproductive and would not solve the problem.

But you should understand that in strategic forces, we are faced with real dilemmas as to whether to go forward or back. If we have reductions in land based missiles we could save 30 billion in MX. If we have reductions that persuade us that the bomber force is quite adequate with the existing bomber force we have, we could save 100 billion dollars over the next 15 years by foregoing the B-1.

So the real question the Carter Administration is facing is whether to make enormous new outlays for strategic forces. The B-1 by itself over 10 or 15 years will cost the whole 1976 defense budget. And the MX will cost 30 billion just to build and you will find that in 10 or 15 years, I believe, that we face the same problem with land based missiles, the same on paper vulnerability, that we face now. So I think the real savings in reductions is going to turn out to be the unnecessary to modernize and maintain the otherwise larger and more changeable strategic forces we would have to have.

Q. Does recent Soviet military activity alter or change your estimation of Soviet intentions?

Cox. In the conventional area they have increased the size of their ground forces to about 4.4 million men. But as I said in my remarks, a great deal of that is directed toward China. One of the difficulties you often see in the press when there is an estimate of the Soviet defense budget and the Soviet strength, is that it is reported as though all of that strength is directed against the United States and its allies. If you reduce that budget, by the proportion that is directed at China, you get a budget that is a good deal smaller than that of the United States and its allies. This you seldom see reported in the press.

Another thing that you seldom see analyzed is this so-called "panel A" and "panel B" debate brought out about the relative size of percentage of Gross National Product that goes into military spending. The recent CIA estimate jumped that from 6 to 8% in 1975 for the Soviets to 11 to 13% and the U.S. has something less than 6%. But the thing again that you seldom see reported to follow on is that the United States has a Gross National Product more than twice than the Soviets. And of course if you put in the Germans, and the British and so on, you have quite a different balance.

This kind of reporting, I have to maintain, is very sloppy and gives the average citizen an impression of tremendous Soviet growth which is inaccurate and unbalanced in terms of that kind of thing.

SCOVILLE. These new increased dollar values that are put on the Soviet military budget really don't mean they are getting any more military equipment out of it. All it is is just a different way of calculating dollars. So, if the situation has not changed one bit from where it was 2 years ago, they just have done it using a different method of making a calculation.

Now as far as the strategic forces are concerned, I have looked at all the numbers that are available, and I think that enough is

available publicly so you can draw a conclusion. But I don't see anything new that is different in terms of Soviet programs over what was there a year ago or even 2 or 3 years ago. It is true they are now moving into MIRV missiles about 5 to 6 years after we did. I don't like it. I think it's a step in the wrong direction. But it doesn't come as a surprise. It's what we predicted except it is a little later than we predicted.

So I really don't see any evidence for a change in strategic posture.

STONE. We're going through a period analogous to the period when the Russian missile buildup was in numbers of missiles. We had already built up to a thousand land based missiles, producing 1 a day. They had for a while been producing 1 a week. And then all of a sudden they went into mass production. There was tremendous concern here about what did it mean. We are concerned now in the sense they must have been even more concerned when we built up.

Now the same thing has happened in the modernization side. They've gotten into in a certain sense mass production of modernization. Actually, it's not going that fast. They are modernizing about 15% of their missile force each year. And it obviously started years ago, so it has all been seen before. What it confirms in my mind, is not a change in their intentions, it doesn't change in my mind its intentions, but it confirms in my mind the fact that the Russians have always suffered from an unfortunate doctrinal lag in strategic thinking. They quite often get around to doing what we did just in time for it to be the wrong thing.

For example, in this case, they are spending \$30 billion, it's estimated, to modernize one missile, the SS11, and spending about \$15 billion to modernize the SS9s. That's a very large sum and at just that time, we have with 1 warhead, the MKL12A, in effect neutralized that land-based missile force even after it gets modernized. Now, of course they're hardening it more too, taking from 300 psi to 1000 psi. But if you look what these warheads could do, a 1000 psi won't be defense against it. So here they are in a kind of doctrine lag pouring even more money into land based forces at just the time we get the drop of those land based forces.

What is confirmed in my mind, and also something to worry about, is mainly the juggernaut spending in the Soviet Union in the defense ministry is probably as hard or harder to stop than our military industrial complex. It is probably quite difficult for the Politbureau or independent civilian analyst to reach into there and say "are you sure this is the stuff you really want?"

So the arms race might go on for a very long time, and in that sense you must be vigilant about what they're up to. But I don't think it confirms any basic change in their intentions.

I want to add one thing to this: On each side those people are trying to stop the armed services; are trying to explain with bureaucratic, social/cultural reasons why the other side is doing what, in fact, it's doing in ways that are acceptable to the hawks on their side to try and get them to cool it.

I was struck by this when I saw in the papers the other day that Abortov, the head of the U.S. Institute in Moscow, had written a paper in *Izvestia* explaining why, in fact, our fears were groundless and added, at the end of it, that one had to understand that the Americans who had 2 oceans at one time, had cultivated a desire for absolute security, and that they were indulging in it with the thought of having to blow every last Russian to bits and having to have all these large measures of security. I don't know if his analysis was right, but I could just hear him trying to explain inside the Soviet Union system the fact that they built all those

missiles doesn't mean they are about to fire them. They're crazy. They build more than they need, you see, and it's because of this 2 ocean thing, you see. So I'm not very sanguine that either he or us will proceed to slow the thing with those kind of metaphors, but I think it illustrates the problem.

NBC'S 3-HOUR SMEAR OF SENATOR JOSEPH MCCARTHY

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, on February 6, 1977, NBC presented a 3-hour fictionalized smear of Senator Joseph McCarthy during prime time.

The program entitled "Tail-Gunner Joe" began by poking fun at the fact that during World War II Senator McCarthy, a Marine Corps intelligence officer in the Pacific theater, volunteered to participate in combat missions with his buddies although he was a decade older than most of them. Now that our media has been working so hard to make heroes out of draft dodgers and deserters, it is not unusual for them to poke fun at a real hero.

Although it would be impossible to answer every lie and distortion presented during a 3-hour television program, I would like to share with my colleagues the facts about some of these lies.

One fictional character stated during the program that Senator McCarthy's investigation of the U.S. Information Agency's Overseas Libraries was a campaign to burn the books of Sherwood Anderson, Stephen Vincent Benet, Mark Twain, Louis Bromfield, Quentin Reynolds, Edna Ferber, and Carl Van Doren. A careful examination of the hearings and reports on this investigation reveals that none of these people or their books were mentioned in any way. In the course of a different series of hearings, Louis Bromfield was described by a witness as an anti-Communist, and another witness questioned whether it was good policy for Voice of America to broadcast criticisms of Texas in one of Miss Ferber's books.

Objectionable books were found in the Overseas Libraries. As a report of Senator McCarthy's permanent Subcommittee on Investigation said,

State Department Information Service libraries abroad function with American taxpayers' money as part of the program to expose and combat communism. The purchase and use of works by authors who are either known Communists or who were long and consistent supporters of the Communist cause by these special-purpose libraries to combat Communist propaganda is obviously inconsistent with the legally defined purpose of these libraries.

According to the report, at least 12 authors who "have been in the past either identified under oath as having been involved or implicated in Soviet espionage or had acted in some important or confidential capacity in behalf of Soviet Russia" had written books found in the

libraries. These included, Cedric Belfrage, Haakon Chevalier, Lauchlin Currie, Israel Epstein, Philip Jaffe, Owen Lattimore, Kate Mitchell, Harriet Lucy Moore, Andrew Roth, Agnes Smedley, Gunther Stein, and Victor Yakhontoff.

Another 13 identified Communist Party members had also written books found in these supposedly anti-Communist Overseas Libraries. These were James S. Allen, Herbert Aptheker, Earl Browder, Howard Fast, Philip Foner, William Z. Foster, William Gropper, Dashiell Hammett, William Mandel, John Reed, Morris U. Schappes, Anna Louise Strong, and Doxey Wilkerson. Report on State Department information program—information centers, January 8, 1954, pages 3-4.

One of the most dramatic as well as unfair segments of the program consisted of an interview with a possibly fictional character who was supposed to be the widow of Roger DeCamp, a Voice of America engineer, who committed suicide because Senator McCarthy had investigated him. No one by that name was mentioned anywhere in the hearings of the McCarthy Committee. The "widow," talking about the transmitters built by her husband, said,

One on the North Carolina coast for Europe. One in Seattle to go the other way. And do you know who decided these were the best spots? M.I.T., the Bureau of Standards, the U.S. Army Signal Corps, that is who decided where to put them . . . McCarthy, and this is hard, it was such insanity, it's hard for me to believe it happened even now—McCarthy decided that the Seattle transmitter should be in California, not in Washington.

An examination of the hearing records showed that an investigation was conducted of the building of two transmitters, one called Baker West in Seattle, the other called Baker East in North Carolina. Expert testimony showed that transmitters at such locations would face the problem of the radio waves passing through a magnetic storm area in the auroral zone, resulting in a 50-percent loss of power 90 percent of the time. Although MIT had at first recommended the Seattle site, they soon changed their minds and recommended a site much further south. The Bureau of Standards had in fact issued a report critical of the Seattle site because of the previously mentioned technical difficulties. A memo prepared by a Voice of America bureaucrat suggested that they retain the Seattle site because, "If the decision is to move to California, we must be prepared to explain fully to the Congress and to the press our reasons for doing so. Such exposure may result in congressional investigation and would not be conducive to our obtaining additional construction funds in the near future." Report on Waste and Mismanagement in Voice of America Engineering Projects, January 25, 1954, pages 2-3.

One of the Senators who was particularly concerned about this example of waste and mismanagement was Senator HENRY JACKSON of Washington who despite his desire to have transmitters built in his home State, played a major role in obtaining the facts which show-

ed that California was a better location. Hearings—State Department Information Program—Voice of America, part 1, page 7, February 16, 1953.

One segment opened with the actor playing Senator McCarthy mumbling a few words and then saying "members of minority groups who have been traitors to this Nation." Only by carefully listening to the words or by checking the typed copy of the notes given by Senator McCarthy to the local radio station at Wheeling, W. Va., would you realize that what he said was, "It has not been the less fortunate, or members of minority groups who have been traitorous to this nation—but rather those who have had all the benefits that the wealthiest Nation on earth has had to offer—the finest homes, the finest college education and the finest jobs in Government we can give." Presenting McCarthy's famous Wheeling, W. Va. speech in such a way as to make him sound as if he said that minority groups were traitors was consistent with a distortion that ran through the entire program. One fictional character supposedly an employee in Senator McCarthy's office referred to "Jewling down" the fee paid to a lecture agency. In fact, not only was Senator McCarthy's chief counsel, Roy Cohen, Jewish, but so was one of his most important advisers, the late Alfred Kohlberg. When Senator McCarthy was under attack a mass rally was organized in his defense in New York by Mr. Kohlberg and Rabbi Benjamin Schultz.

It is interesting to note that one of the heroes presented on this program was the late Senator Ralph Flanders of Vermont who was praised for his speech attacking Senator McCarthy and his introduction of a Senate resolution condemning McCarthy. What was not mentioned on the program was that Senator Flanders was the author of a constitutional amendment called the Christian amendment which would have made it impossible for Jews or other non-Christians to take an oath of office to support and defend the Constitution of the United States. See hearings on the Christian Amendment before the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Senate Judiciary Committee, May 13 and 17, 1954.

A fictional character on the program complained that McCarthy suggested that Flanders was senile. Flanders in his speech attacking McCarthy had implied that McCarthy was a homosexual. The NBC propagandists not only saw nothing wrong with this slanderous charge against McCarthy, but participated in it by having the actor playing the sanctimonious old hypocrite Joseph Welch saying to Senator McCarthy during the Army-McCarthy hearings, "I should say, Mr. Senator, that a pixie is a close relative of a fairy." Welch in 1954 and NBC in 1977 were both playing to the gallery knowing full well that one of the leftist inspired whispering campaigns used against Senator McCarthy was one which falsely labeled him a homosexual.

A particularly stupid falsehood was presented on the program when the actress playing Jean Kerr—later Mrs. McCarthy—and the actor playing Sen-

ator McCarthy engaged in the following dialog:

JEAN KERR. Vice President Nixon called.

MCCARTHY. Did you talk to him?

KERR. Yes—you got it. You have been appointed Chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, and you are permitted, if you want, to become Chairman of its own permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

Anyone who knows anything about the Senate is aware that chairmanships are given based on seniority and not by the Vice President of the United States. The use of Nixon's name in this context was to smear McCarthy by identifying him long after McCarthy's death. Nixon himself had been splattered with the mud thrown at McCarthy even though his critics knew that Nixon, instead of supporting McCarthy, had joined in the Eisenhower administration "dirty tricks" to destroy Senator McCarthy.

An interesting segment that would be clear only to those on the inside showed an actor playing a British writer who complained that he was deported from the United States because McCarthy demanded it. Only those persons fully familiar with the personalities active at that time would have recognized the character portrayed as Cedric Belfrage. Belfrage's name is never mentioned. But on May 16, 1953, one of the more hysterical British newspapers, *The Daily Herald*, headlined, "Briton Attacked by McCarthy Arrested". The story started: Washington, Friday—The witch-hunting Senator McCarthy today carried out his threat to have a British writer arrested for refusing to say whether he was a Communist.

The Briton, Cedric Belfrage, edits the leftwing New York magazine *National Guardian*. He was taken by immigration officers to Ellis Island for deportation.

Belfrage had appeared as a witness before the House Committee on Un-American Activities on May 5, 1953, and before Senator McCarthy's Senate Permanent Investigations Subcommittee on May 14, 1953. During the House committee hearings Belfrage was confronted with the evidence that he had been a Communist sympathizer in England and a Communist Party member in the United States. Martin Berkeley had identified him as a member of the Communist Party and Elizabeth Bentley had identified him as a member of the Soviet spy ring for which she had served as a courier. This information was later used at an immigration hearing which resulted in the deportation of Belfrage. At the hearing of the House committee he had invoked the fifth amendment. Hearing—Investigation of Communist Activities in the New York City Area, part II, May 5, 1953, pages 1272-1301.

On May 14, 1953, when Belfrage appeared before the McCarthy committee a Senator said,

Well, I think personally if you have been over here for 16 years and have taken the advantages of the American way of life and are either afraid or ashamed to say that you do or do not believe in the overthrow of the American Government, the sooner you leave the shores of the United States the better it would be for the United States.

This was said not by Senator McCarthy but by Senator Stuart Symington.

Hearings—State Department Information Program—Information Centers, part VI, May 14, 1953, pages 413 and 414.

The biggest lie of the program and the culmination of all the other lies was when one of the fictional characters said at the end of the program, "But he himself caught no Communists, found no traitors, uncovered no subversives, not one."

I could list many hundreds of Communists, subversives, and traitors exposed by Senator McCarthy. I will name just a few. Let us start with William Remington who was on McCarthy's original list of Communists in the State Department. Remington was later convicted of perjury when he denied being a member of a Soviet spy ring in the government. The evidence was overwhelming and witnesses included Elizabeth Bentley as well as Remington's former wife. Remington subsequently died in prison.

In the course of the McCarthy Committee investigations at Fort Monmouth, N.J., a number of security risks were identified. One of them, Aaron Coleman, admitted having been a member of the Young Communist League with convicted Soviet spy Julius Rosenberg. Although Rosenberg had admitted seeing Coleman at Fort Monmouth, Coleman denied this. However, Coleman admitted that he had been caught taking classified material off the post. He maintained that he had done this only because he was working on it at home. Army Signal Corps—Subversion and Espionage, parts I and II, October–December, 1953.

It was in the course of the same hearings that the famous Annie Lee Moss case took place. Mrs. Moss was a code clerk at the Pentagon. An FBI undercover agent, Mary Markward, had identified Mrs. Moss as a member of the Communist Party. After extensive testimony in which she denied her membership and attempted to say that she was being confused with someone else with the same name, Senator Symington stated,

If you are not taken back into the Army (employment), you come around and see me, and I am going to see that you get a job.

Army Signal Corps—Subversion and Espionage, part X, March 11, 1954, pages 443-462. Mrs. Moss had been suspended from her job with the Army pending a loyalty review board hearing.

During the course of her committee testimony, Moss stated that for a period of time she had lived at 72 R Street, Washington, D.C.

In 1958 the Communist Party, U.S.A. in an appeal to the U.S. Court of Appeals, District of Columbia, asked that the testimony of Mrs. Markward be stricken from the record of the Subversive Activities Control Board which had used her testimony to find the Communist Party to be an agent of the Soviet Union. They used as the basis for their request Mrs. Markward's allegedly false testimony in regard to Annie Lee Moss. The court ordered the production of the FBI files on the Moss case. These were inspected by the Subversive Activities Control Board which concluded:

The situation that has resulted on the Annie Lee Moss question is that copies of

the Communist Party's own records, the authenticity of which the Party has at no time disputed, were produced to it (A. G. Exs. 499 to 511, inc.) and show that one Annie Lee Moss, 72 R Street, S.W., Washington, D.C., was a Party member in the mid-1940's. Yet, on several occasions before the Court of Appeals and the Board the Party charges that witness Markward had committed perjury before the Defense Department in the Moss Security Hearing in testifying to what the Party's own records showed to be the fact.

We conclude that upon production of the documents demanded by respondent, the Communist Party's charge that Markward gave perjurious testimony was not substantiated. Consequently, Mrs. Markward's credibility is no way impaired by the Annie Lee Moss matter.

Subversive Activities Control Board, Docket No. 51-101, Modified Report of the Board on Second Remand, page 4.

On the program the actor pretending to be Senator McCarthy attributed to Owen Lattimore the invention of the term "McCarthyism." Senator McCarthy would never have said that since he was aware that the term had been invented by the Communist Party newspaper the *Daily Worker*. According to the program Senator McCarthy apparently attacked Lattimore because he had written some books. In fact, McCarthy had accused Lattimore of aiding the Soviets and being involved in the sell-out of free China. In 1952, almost 2 years after McCarthy's charges were aired, the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security, after taking 14 volumes of testimony on the Institute for Pacific Relations, found that, "Owen Lattimore was, from some time beginning in the 1930's, a conscious articulate instrument of the Soviet conspiracy." Senator McCarthy was not a member of that committee. Report—Institute of Pacific Relations, July 2, 1952, page 224.

There is much more that I intend to say about this distorted and unfair television presentation. I will continue discussing this matter after the recess.

TRIBUTE TO SPECIAL AGENT
JAMES J. DEARY, FBI

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, the strength of our national commitment to law enforcement is found in the record of those charged with upholding the law. These past few years have seen many instances of willful abuse and infringement of the law by officials who should know better. This contempt for the public trust must not blind us, however, to the superlative achievements constantly and often unobtrusively performed by the great majority of our Nation's law enforcement officers. These brave men and women have taken on the most difficult and many times the most thankless task which our society offers, for the good of their fellow citizens, to insure that the transgressions of the few do not upset the peace and order of our

communities. For such dedication and selfless service, these citizens justly deserve our praise and loyalty.

Connecticut has benefited from the past 29 years in this regard from the distinguished efforts of Special Agent James J. Deary of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. This tireless and innovative leader in his profession has brought credit to himself and his organization by numerous acts of faithful, patient work in the criminal and security field. An active member of the Connecticut Chiefs of Police, Agent Deary has made notable contributions to the furtherance of respect for the law in my home State by his sponsorship of improved police training procedures and methods. His leadership in this area is truly outstanding. The present police training program in Connecticut owes virtually its whole substance to the unremitting labors of Agent Jim Deary.

Jim takes pride in having played a major role in obtaining the legislation to mandate police training in the State of Connecticut and in the establishment of the Connecticut Police Academy in Meriden. He has assisted in sending more police officers to special courses in Connecticut and to the FBI Academy in Quantico, Va., than any other representative in law enforcement.

I have been fortunate to have Jim Deary and his wife Norma and their four children live in Wallingford, which is in my Third Congressional District, for as long as I have been in Congress. With such neighbors, I could not feel more secure. Jim is respected by all who know him. Now, on the occasion of his impending retirement, February 11, 1977, after 33 years with the FBI, I wish to express my special thanks for a job well done to Agent James J. Deary. Men like Jim Deary are far too few among us, and it is with some pride and much respect that I join with his colleagues, family, and friends in wishing Jim Deary the best of everything for the future.

CALIFORNIA: NATIONAL GAS SUPPLIER TODAY; WHAT ABOUT TOMORROW?

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, this winter season, as we all know, is a harsh and severe one on the lives and livelihood of thousands of Americans. Not since the OPEC oil boycott has the need for sacrifices by the American people been so urgent.

My home State of California has suffered much less than the Eastern half of the country. Because of the warm weather, the Southern California Gas Co. and Pacific Gas & Electric Co. have together transferred some 12 billion cubic feet of natural gas to the East for essential heating purposes. That is enough to service approximately 1.2 million homes here on the East coast for a month.

California is happy to have been of help to the fuel short areas of the United

States. Southern California Gas Co. and P.G. & E. deserve commendation for showing the ability to help out during the crisis. However, there is a real danger that California's own bleak energy outlook may be forgotten as we share apparent surpluses.

Within the next 4 to 5 years, unless new sources are tapped, California will lose about 25 percent of its supply of natural gas due to the loss of out-of-State suppliers. Alaskan North Slope gas will not begin to flow until 1983 at the earliest. In the meantime, deep concerns over the safety of liquefied natural gas may threaten the availability of that source of fuel. And, research into coal gasification has been stalemated.

Mr. Speaker, California's consumers have adequate supplies of natural gas today, but critical shortages are predicted for tomorrow. We in the Congress have a choice—we can ignore the warnings of future shortages, or we can take bold bipartisan action to assure that natural gas and other essential fuels are in abundant supply for all sections of our country.

California acted as a supplier this winter, but what about next winter, and the one after that. Unless the Congress acts, California will be hard pressed to service its own customers.

FEDERAL AGENCY PILOT TERMINATION AND REVIEW ACT OF 1977

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, on May 21 last I introduced H.R. 13947, the Federal Agency Pilot Termination and Review Act. The Honorable GARY HART of Colorado had introduced an identical sunset measure in the Senate on April 14. It is with great pleasure that I introduce a modified version of that bill today.

Most of us agree that we must tackle head-on the twin problems of inefficiency in Government and unaccountability in Government. Zero-base budgeting or other compulsory performance review procedures may help us do this. I am persuaded that the Federal Agency Pilot Termination and Review Act is a most promising and practical bill.

In the 94th Congress the greatest defect of most zero-base or sunset legislation was its scope. Many of the bills would have provided either zero-base budgeting or some other compulsory performance review for the entire Federal bureaucracy. As a distinguished colleague of mine, the Honorable Jack Brooks, has said, Government-wide zero-base review would "lead to a paperwork process that is mind-boggling even by Washington standards." Mr. Brooks has told David Broder of the Washington Post that "we don't have the capability" for a zero-base review of such magnitude. Because I agree with my friend my bill calls for a pilot project to review the performance of just three

Federal agencies in 1 year and three more Federal agencies in the following year. Mr. BROOKS has also suggested the "restructuring and reequipping of the Office of Management and Budget so it will have the organizational capacity to re-evaluate honestly and on a yield basis the programs and agencies now operating." My bill gives the Office of Management and Budget, the General Accounting Office and the Congressional Budget Office the experience they need to develop the capability for comprehensive performance audits.

Some people believe that the scheduling of a sunset, that is, the expiration of the mandate of an agency to exist, is too peculiar or drastic a way to eliminate waste in government. Such people may reconsider their view of sunset legislation if they but survey the past performance of Congress. They will see that Congress needs the sort of powerful incentive provided by sunset legislation if it is to undertake a serious, full-scale review of a Federal agency.

Let me explain how the proposed legislation works. Under the sunset concept embodied in it a Federal agency would face a fixed termination date. Congressional review of the agency's performance, undertaken in the light of the purposes for which the agency was established, would be mandatory. Not less than 15 months prior to the termination date the Office of Management and Budget, the General Accounting Office and the Congressional Budget Office would prepare assessments of the agency to be reviewed and would forward the assessments to the appropriate committees of Congress. Not less than 1 year prior to the termination date the appropriate committees of Congress would hold public hearings on the assessments. At the hearings the agency's director would be expected to defend his or her agency and make a case for its continued existence. Other interested individuals or groups would be invited to make their recommendations.

With all the evidence in hand, the committees of Congress could recommend that the agency be continued unchanged or with modifications for 6 years, after which period the review process would be repeated. However, the committees of Congress could recommend that the agency be terminated. If Congress concurred, then no further legislative action would be necessary: the agency would cease to exist on the termination date.

The Federal Agency Pilot Termination and Review Act has many features that distinguish it from other zero-base or sunset bills. First, it derives from the original sunset concept developed by Common Cause and enacted in Colorado with the support of political liberals and conservatives alike. Second, it provides for a pilot project involving only six Federal agencies: the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Federal Aviation Administration and the Occupational Safety and Health Administration would terminate on October 1, 1980, while the Federal Energy Administration, the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Federal Maritime Commission would terminate on October 1, 1981. Third, it would provide for equitable treatment of civil servants

on the rolls of discontinued agencies. Finally, the Attorney General would assume responsibility for any agency actions pending on the date of termination.

Mr. Speaker, in this year of a new President, a new Congress and a new century of American independence, I hope that we shall see the beginnings of increased efficiency in Government and increased accountability in Government. The Federal Agency Pilot Termination and Review Act could make a major contribution. I appeal for prompt and full consideration of this measure.

DR. SYBIL MOBLEY, SUCCESSFUL
PIONEER IN BUSINESS EDUCATION

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, business is the lifeblood for a strong and healthy economy for our Nation.

There have been many innovative approaches to provide our youth with a good business education, but few as unique and as successful as a warm and dear friend, Dr. Sybil Mobley, founder and dean of the School of Business at Florida A. & M. University at Tallahassee, Fla., in the heart of my second congressional district.

I would like to present to my colleagues in the Congress an article published recently in the Orlando Sentinel-Star which tells of Dr. Mobley's remarkable success. It is an extraordinary story of an extraordinary person.

The article follows:

FLORIDA A. & M. INTERNS SYSTEM PLEASES
DOCTOR NAMED MOBLEY
(By D. G. Lawrence)

TALLAHASSEE.—There's a success story here in the mold of George Washington Carver.

Dr. Sybil Mobley, founder and dean of predominantly black Florida A & M's School of Business and Industry, has attracted national attention.

Carver had to beg and borrow to make Tuskegee the center for peanut and sweet potato research, in the process revitalizing the Deep South's dying agriculture.

A half century later, Dr. Mobley has achieved national acclaim for her school. But with a difference. National business leaders have been uncommonly generous with financial support.

In the past year, they've poured \$500,000 into its operation.

"And I'll get another \$500,000 before the end of this year," said a super-confident Dr. Mobley.

She took over the school's moribund business department in 1971 and three years later persuaded the regents to make it a full-fledged school.

Only a handful of whites are among the school's 1,100 students.

"We have not solicited white students because we feared they would enroll for some social reason, not for the education we provided. But our school is so good that soon we'll have more white students than we can handle, motivated only by a desire to participate in the best business education offered."

"The dozen whites we have now are all superstars."

All her pupils rank high scholastically.—A number have scored as high as 489 out of 495 on the 12th-grade placement tests.

"We not only have a rigorous, demanding program in everything that is standard in a business education, but we go the other mile—we add the extra things that the business world tells us not even the most prestigious universities supply."

No other school, she said, offers three internships to students during their four years in college.

"It's because of our broad business support that we can do it."

Business graduates each get from 15 to 18 job offers, and they are the most sought-after students in the country, she boasts.

She concedes some interest is spurred by industry and business fulfilling affirmative action by hiring blacks for management positions.

"In fact, Price, Waterhouse came here, they told me, because it is a black school. But they stayed with us because it is a good school."

Not too long ago, Price, Waterhouse, a national accounting firm, held a luncheon at New York's Rockefeller Center Rainbow Room so Dr. Mobley could tell the university's story to area business leaders.

The school's major contributors include the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, \$100,000; Price, Waterhouse, Ernst and Ernst, and Haskins and Sells, all national accounting firms, and General Electric, which each gave \$75,000 and \$60,000 from International Business Machines.

"Dr. Mobley has a very ambitious program," William Gifford, of Price, Waterhouse, said "She stands out among educators and the FA&MU program is one that deserves endorsement."

A spokesman for Ernst and Ernst agreed. "We were impressed with the fact they are relating their program to today's business world."

What impressed him was that most graduates have completed internships in three different aspects of their majors, often in three different parts of the country. Dr. Mobley has convinced a number of private concerns and government agencies to employ students for a quarter and pay them from \$650 to \$1,050 monthly to work in their major field.

Elliott Hobbs, a junior from Tallahassee, has just completed an internship with Chemical Bank of New York in Management information systems.

"It gave me a feel for business," she told Dr. Mobley.

She's a story in herself.

After graduating from Bristol College, Dallas, Texas (she majored in sociology) she came to Tallahassee, the only job she could get was as a clerk-typist at Florida A&M. That was in 1945. Fourteen years later she went back to school fulltime, earned her masters in business management from the University of Illinois, and then her doctorate at the prestigious Wharton School of the University of Pennsylvania. With her certified public accountant's license, she worked for Union Carbide, Price, Waterhouse, Chase-Manhattan Bank, the Internal Revenue Service, before coming back to Florida A&M.

She revitalized the school's curriculum so that a graduate is ready for every aspect of business leadership.

She calls it a leadership program, combining teaching of business principles with instruction in the social skills, memory and articulation, an awareness of social and political issues. Perhaps most important, she feels, is the internship program: Students getting actual business experience and being paid for it.

AMERICANS WANT CIVIL DEFENSE
BOOST

HON. BILL CHAPPELL, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Speaker, in recent months there have been several reports which indicate that the Soviet Union is continuing, on a steady basis, a large-scale civil defense program designed to protect the Soviet people and Soviet industry in the event of a nuclear attack. This has been occurring at a time when the American civil defense program has seen a period of rapid decline.

The results of a recently concluded Gallup Poll indicate that a sizable number of Americans are concerned with this issue and are in favor of an increased emphasis on civil preparedness and civil defense.

In light of recent Soviet actions with regard to civil defense I believe it would be appropriate to begin public discussion of this issue with an eye toward increasing our capability in this vital area.

Toward this end I am inserting in the RECORD the article detailing the results of this poll by George Gallup which appeared in the Orlando Sentinel Star on January 23, 1977.

The article follows:

AMERICANS WANT CIVIL DEFENSE

PRINCETON, N.J.—The American people reveal a glaring lack of awareness of the civil defense system in their communities, but at the same time vote in favor of stepped-up efforts to protect the populace.

Some civil defense experts believe it is high time the nation debate the so-called "survival gap" between the U.S. and the Soviet Union. Concerned over indications that the Soviet Union is conducting a massive program to protect its people and industry in the event of a nuclear attack, these experts believe the U.S. has no alternative but to undertake an all-out civil defense program of its own. It is argued that the U.S. must do so to preserve the "balance of terror" which is the heart of the mutual deterrence doctrine.

Experts believe that the Russians have been building underground facilities since 1952 in an attempt to provide protection for the entire population. It is pointed out that every industrial worker in Russia is required to take a 20-hour course in civil defense procedures. The Russian outlay for civil defense is believed to be several times the \$80 million a year budget for the existing U.S. civil defense effort.

The Gallup Poll recently conducted a nationwide survey to learn what Americans know about the present civil defense program in the U.S., their state of preparedness in the case of attack and their views on ways to protect the populace. The findings show the following:

Nearly half (45 percent) of all persons interviewed said they did not know whether or not a Civil Defense organization exists in their communities. The figure is even higher among persons living in the nation's largest cities.

Three in four (74 percent) say they do not know where the nearest public shelter, if any, is located. Again the figure is higher among inhabitants of large cities.

Although Americans reveal a lack of awareness regarding our civil defense system, considerable support is found for greater protection of the populace. More than four in

10 (44 per cent) think the U.S. should do more in this respect than we are now doing. Among the "aware groups"—those who know whether or not there is a Civil Defense organization in their communities or know where the nearest shelter is—support, for greater protection is even higher. The proportion is also higher among those who believe their communities are a likely target for nuclear attack.

Nearly four in 10 (37 per cent) would favor having every new house built in the United States required to have a bomb shelter, with the federal government paying most of the costs. Again, the proportion in favor is higher among the "aware" groups and those who believe their community is a likely target for nuclear attack.

TRIBUTE TO JAMES WESLEY BRYAN

HON. NORMAN D. DICKS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, as a new Member of the House of Representatives, from Washington, I would like to take a moment to pay tribute to one of my predecessors, James Wesley Bryan, who was elected to this body 64 years ago. He was the grandfather of the present Kitsap County Superior Court judge, Robert J. Bryan.

James Wesley Bryan was elected to the U.S. House of Representatives as a Congressman-at-large from Washington State in 1913 on the Bull Moose—Progressive Party—ticket.

Bryan was born March 11, 1874, in Lake Charles, La., where he lived throughout his childhood. In his midteens years he attended Baylor University in Waco, Tex., graduating in 1895. A year of saving and borrowing permitted him to realize a dream of attending and graduating from Yale University Law School in 1897.

He practiced law for a few years in Louisiana, married Lorene Kearsse, who blessed him with three children.

In 1904, Bryan moved his family to Bremerton, Wash., in the Pacific Northwest. He practiced law for a few years before he stepped into the political arena. He served 2 years in the Washington State Senate, then won his seat in Congress.

As a friend and supporter of President Theodore Roosevelt, this distinguished Congressman from Washington worked to the creation of legislation, much of which is part of our way of life today.

Among those accomplishments, are: the Merchant Marine; public transportation; income tax; 8-hour work day; minimum wage and child labor laws; public ownership of gas, water, and light; Government support for and development of Alaska; expansion of Puget Sound Naval Yard and protection and rights of its civilian employees; and national forest preserves and support of Gifford Pinchot's forest programs.

In a 1914 debate on the floor of the House of Representatives, Congressman Bryan urged his colleagues to extend the Nation's naval fleet to the Pacific coast:

The people (of America) expect our Navy to retain its rank and place among the Navies of the world. It seems to me, however, that in the distribution of the fleet of this country the department has not given that consideration to the Pacific coast that ought to be given. All our battleships are kept on the Atlantic coast—As we consider the commercial operations and industrial enterprises of the future, we are bound to recognize that the great bulk of all of that progress and activity is going to be in the Pacific Ocean.—That is where we are going to be called upon to fight the real Naval battles.

That statement was made in 1914, and a very prophetic statement, indeed.

Congressman Bryan returned to his home in Bremerton, where he continued in politics after his term in the Congress. He was Bremerton city attorney and was county prosecuting attorney during prohibition.

Former Congressman Bryan died in Bremerton in 1956, after a most distinguished career in local, State, and national politics.

TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICES

HON. GLADYS NOON SPELLMAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mrs. SPELLMAN. Mr. Speaker, a need exists for further committee hearings on various telecommunications bills now pending before Congress. This is due to the vast differences in opinion on the effects the proposed legislation would have on the communications industry as a whole and the A.T. & T. system in particular. Most importantly the economic and service efficiency impact of the bills on private and business users of the telecommunications services throughout the United States is as yet undetermined. That we have the best telephone service in the world today is undisputed. How to meet the needs of the future is a hotly contested issue.

The House Subcommittee on Communications held preliminary hearings in October 1976, inquiring into the controversial subject of competition in the telephone industry and the effects the proposed bills—including the A.T. & T.-sponsored Consumer Communications Reform Act, H.R. 12323—would have on this significant aspect. The rapidly expanding importance and ever increasing role which data processing and the interconnect industry play in telecommunications were also highlighted by the hearings.

The following points of debate and of issues raised which have come to my attention will illustrate a few of the conflicting views which must be aired and considered prior to the passage or rejection of major legislation directly affecting every user of the Nation's telecommunications services. With 94 percent of all American households possessing telephones and virtually all businesses relying on telecommunications as a lifeline to their existence, the essential question of whether the time is right for a congressional restatement of tele-

communications policy cannot be answered until hearings enable the delineation of the many differing opinions.

A.T. & T., the largest proponent of the legislation, argues that the very nature of the phone industry and the Communications Act of 1934—the basic statement of America's national telecommunications policy—necessitates a natural monopoly of telecommunications. Backers of the legislation argue that increasing competition in the industry could force residential telephone rates up as much as 70 percent within the next few years.

Opponents to the proposed bills, the Federal Communications Commission, and other Government agencies claim there is no evidence that competition to date, or in the immediate future will force residential rates upward.

The 1968 Carterfone decision by the FCC allowed the "interconnection" industry to develop. Customers can now buy a variety of new terminal equipment and interconnect it to A.T. & T.'s lines and instruments. Many people are of the opinion that this limited competition has not adversely affected rates the typical consumer must pay for the telephone use and has helped businesses enormously by providing less expensive and more technologically advanced communications equipment that can be bought rather than leased. Bell contends such services which provide non-Bell equipment threaten the quality of the Bell system by producing technical problems which impair the quality of services, necessitate greater expenditures for maintenance, and ultimately will result in increased costs to the consumer.

Opponents to the bill state that no evidence of problems due to interconnect items exist and that the legislation is a tactic used by A.T. & T. to circumvent the FCC and recent court cases which allow competition in limited fields of the telecommunications industry.

The Communications Act of 1934 called for the development of an efficient, high-quality nationwide communications service available to all the people of the United States at reasonable costs. Was the intent of the Communications Act of 1934 that the Nation should be served by a single integrated telecommunications system? Those in favor of this legislation suggest that it was, and are seeking to "reestablish" that intent by passage of the bill. Opponents claim passage will have the effect of putting the newly founded and expanding interconnect and data processing telecommunications industries out of business, nullify the recent policies of the FCC, and insure a total monopoly of telecommunications in the United States by A.T. & T., a corporation which already controls approximately 96 percent of the telecommunications services in the Nation.

A.T. & T. claims the bill will not destroy the new interconnect data processing and satellite communications industry, but only stop the competitors from supplying the same services which A.T. & T. provides to its customers. Opponents to this view argue that limited competition already in existence has had the advantage of committing A.T. & T. to provide more diverse and more tech-

nologically advanced equipment to its customers.

Some legislators are discussing the possibility of rewriting the 1934 Communications Act in its entirety to keep the Nation's policies abreast of the technological leaps and bounds this country is witnessing in the communications field; a field which grows in importance yearly.

The New York Times Sunday magazine of November 28, 1976, in an article on the proposed legislation, quoted a member of the House Communications Subcommittee, as follows:

After two days of hearings we know we have a good system and nobody wants to destroy it. After that nobody agrees on anything.

Mr. Speaker, we can, at least, agree that more hearings must be scheduled, and for this reason I have introduced House Resolution 136. I urge my colleagues to familiarize themselves with the many complex aspects of this matter and to support additional hearings on the telecommunications policy of this Nation.

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

HON. CHARLES E. GRASSLEY

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. Speaker, the news media has been flooded in recent months with stories about Gary Gilmore, who was convicted last summer of murdering two Utah residents and subsequently sentenced to die. For months, so-called citizens' groups tried to save Gilmore's life. Can you imagine that? One lawyer went so far as to argue that putting Gilmore to death would be cruel to other prisoners on death row.

The press made Gilmore something of a national hero. We almost forgot that he was convicted for the cold-blooded slaying of two innocent men. Finally, despite all the last minute intercessions, Gilmore was shot to death last week by a Utah firing squad.

Whether or not we believe in capital punishment, we can learn a good lesson from the Gary Gilmore case—that in all too many instances, we forget the victims of crime while being overly concerned with the rights of the criminals.

Crime is a problem that affects us all. We pay for it in higher insurance rates, higher taxes to support law enforcement, higher product prices to cover the costs of shoplifting, and vandalism. Sometimes we pay for it with our lives. In the few minutes I am talking to you today, across the United States there will be committed nine major crimes, like murder, robbery, rape, or assault.

What can be done to stem our rising crime rate? First of all we need to guarantee that people who commit crimes are punished. Mandatory prison sentences for specific crimes, with a minimum amount of time which must be served would provide that guarantee. Law-enforcement officials agree that the best

deterrent to crime is the promise of swift and sure punishment. After all, imprisonment is designed not just for rehabilitation, but also for punishment.

We especially need mandatory minimum sentences for persons committing crimes with guns, and for those who commit exceptionally serious crimes and, of course, for repeat offenders. For the most serious crimes, we should consider capital punishment.

National columnist Patrick Buchanan once said, and I quote:

To suggest that the death penalty is simply legalized murder is as silly as suggesting that arrest and imprisonment are nothing more than legalized kidnapping and legalized slavery. Use of the death penalty in capital crimes, the ultimate punishment from which there is no appeal, is the mark of a society which holds dear the life of its citizens. It is the society which holds life cheap that imposes weak penalties for the taking of a life.

Seventy-four percent of the offenders released from prison in 1972 were rearrested within 4 years. Seventy-one percent of those released on parole, and over half of those out on probation committed crimes again resulting in their arrest. Therefore, it seems we need to examine our system of granting parole and probation and then make those privileges more difficult to obtain.

We also need to make it harder for criminals awaiting trial to be released. Frequently they commit further crimes before being brought to judgment on their first offense.

Even when criminals are tried, they may be encouraged to plead guilty to lesser charges. The American Bar Association has recommended phasing out plea bargaining. We should also reconsider the use of suspended sentences and concurrent sentences.

Finally, we must take a harder stand on juvenile crime, for that is where the real increase in crime is occurring. In 1975, juveniles accounted for almost half of all serious crimes in this country. Let us treat juveniles who commit serious crimes like adults.

Our lenient policies toward criminals in recent years have proven ineffective in reducing crime. In fact, the result has been just the opposite. Let us see what a get-tough attitude toward the criminal at the local, State, and national level—a real return to law and order—can do.

Perhaps then we will find that Gary Gilmore did not die in vain.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained in my office earlier today during the procedural vote to approve the Journal of yesterday's proceedings in the House.

I was meeting with officers of the U.S.

Army Corps of Engineers concerning beach erosion and other environmental programs of great importance to my constituents.

Had I been present for the vote, I would have voted "aye."

THE PRESIDENTIAL PAY RECOMMENDATIONS OF JANUARY 17, 1977

HON. HAROLD L. VOLKMER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, perhaps I am being presumptuous as a freshman to come before you today to urge the members of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee to report out a resolution disapproving the pay increase for Members of Congress, the judiciary, and certain executive branch personnel.

The public is entitled to have a recorded vote on this issue. This Congress has made a commendable beginning in openness in Government. To prevent a vote on this proposal would be a backward step from above board, open Government and would confirm in many of the minds of the public the old image of Congress and would lessen the confidence of the public in Congress. Today, that confidence is needed more than ever.

I, for one, cannot say that I cannot use the money. I do not have much outside income and the high cost of living in Washington, where I have brought my family to live, along with the normal deductions for taxes, retirement, and insurance do not leave me with a great deal of spending money under the present pay raise.

However, I believe that we are at a time where there is a chance that we could hold down inflation if we could hold down the pressures for increased demands for higher prices and higher wages. As Members of Congress, we cannot ask others to do what we are not willing to do. We must be leaders and not followers, and we must lead both business and labor through the next 2 years to hold the line on inflationary increases.

As I have said before, I could use the money. I know, however, that there are many people in this country who are worse off than I am and inflation is dealing a severe blow to them at this time. Those persons on a fixed income, including private retirement, social security, railroad retirement, and veterans benefits are more in need of additional funds than I. Also, those people who are in a low-income group, working for a minimum wage or those working part time or drawing unemployment compensation are more in need of the money than I. If, because Congress permits the pay raise to go through, inflationary pressures are brought about to increase wages among all the other Federal employees and among private employers for their employees, these same retired and low-income people will be worse off than they are now.

Someone has to take the first step, and I believe it should be Congress, as the leader of the people, who takes the first step to say no. We will hold the line, we will make sacrifices that we feel are necessary in order to get the economy back on its feet.

As far as the judiciary is concerned, I am sure that very few Federal judges will retire, because they did not get the increased pay. Those who do retire will have well-qualified replacements in a very short time. Any member of the judiciary, Members of Congress, or the executive branch can be replaced with qualified people.

I do plan, in the very near future, to make a full financial disclosure of all my assets and liabilities. If there is any doubt that I could use the increase in pay, it will become readily apparent upon examination of the disclosure that I am not speaking as a person of private means or wealth.

The Members of Congress have a commitment. That commitment is not to other Members of Congress, your friends, and colleagues. That commitment is to the people of this country.

We must have a vote on this resolution and when we do I will vote against the increase in pay.

STAFF ALLOWANCES FOR EX-PRESIDENTS

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a companion bill to S. 646 introduced in the other body by the senior Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY) on February 4, 1977. This legislation would remove the present \$96,000 statutory ceiling on staff allowances for ex-Presidents, beginning with former President Ford. It would also fix the rates of compensation for particular staff members. The purpose of this amendment to the Former Presidents Act is to permit adjustments in the staff allowances, according to need, through the appropriations process.

Mr. Speaker, the request for fiscal 1978 for former President Ford is \$146,000 in staff allowances. The GAO has noted that the present \$96,000 per annum ceiling represents a drastic reduction in force from the staff available to a President during the 6-month period following his departure from office. An outgoing President can now receive up to \$1 million during this period. And yet, according to the 1975 GAO report on Federal assistance for Presidential transitions:

The workload of a former President did not decline as rapidly after the first six months as the much-reduced staff level in the Former Presidents Act requires.

I think the Congress can responsibly adjust these allowances to more realistically reflect actual need through the annual appropriations process. Instead of an arbitrary ceiling, we would be making our decisions on the basis of the

actual workload of a former President's staff.

WHY CONGRESS MUST VOTE ON ITS PAY

HON. LARRY PRESSLER

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. Speaker, I testified yesterday before the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee's Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Presidential Pay Recommendations. I left the hearing room—after waiting 3 hours to testify—believing that my colleagues are unwilling to report one of the resolutions pending before it regarding the recommendations of the President with respect to congressional pay.

I have no quarrel with those who wish to accept the pay increase, but I do want those who favor or oppose this 28.9-percent increase to go on record as having voted "yes" or "no" on whether or not to accept this raise. Many people in my district in South Dakota ask me how I, or other Members of Congress, vote on pay raises. There is no way that I can direct them to look in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to find this information, because we do not vote to approve a pay raise.

At the subcommittee hearings yesterday, there was a discussion of whether this issue of pay raises for Congress is insignificant when compared to welfare reform, jobs bills, and reducing unemployment. It is not an insignificant issue, because our constituents have a constitutional right to demand—and expect—accountability from their elected officials. This responsibility to our constituents demands that we vote—yes or no—on the issue of congressional pay raises. This vote for the sake of accountability is just as important on this issue as it is for any other measure considered by Congress.

My constituents have indicated their support for a vote on congressional pay raises, and I have had calls and letters from Texas, California, New York, Maryland, Virginia, and other States supporting my efforts to get this issue on the floor for a vote. Many of the letters I have received from around the country object to the pay raise itself, but most of these letters also contain thoughts like this one, which I received from a woman in Kentucky:

Isn't there a way to force Congress to record their votes individually? I want to know how my Congressmen vote.

What is our reply to those who ask this question? Many of us are trying to get this issue onto the House floor for a vote. We cannot be too confident that Congress will vote for its pay, however, because ever since the 1967 law which allows the pay increases to go forward automatically, 83 resolutions of disapproval of pay have been introduced in the House and no action has been taken to get them to the floor.

Those of us who wish to go on the record as having supported or opposed

this pay increase should be given this opportunity. We have a constitutional responsibility to hold ourselves accountable to those who pay our salaries—the citizens of our country.

Mr. Speaker, to make clear my stand on this issue, I wish to insert the letter from the Washington Star, Tuesday, February 8, 1977:

AUTOMATIC RAISES FOR CONGRESS?

An Associated Press story in The Star on Jan. 21 accurately stated that I have a lawsuit before the Supreme Court, challenging the Congressional pay raise procedures. However, it inaccurately stated that I think Congressmen currently are overpaid.

The purpose of my suit has nothing to do with the pay level. Rather, I want to have a vote on Congressional pay. The current automatic pay raise laws allow a Congressional pay raise to go forward automatically unless one house votes it down within 30 days after its proposal. Thus, the 1968 and 1975 pay raises went forward automatically, and the 1977 pay raise probably will go forward automatically—that is, without any roll-call vote.

The Constitution requires a vote on Congressional pay. It does not specifically require a vote on civil service, military or judicial pay, but it does on the pay of Congressmen. Indeed, at the Constitutional Convention, James Madison settled the argument over having individual states pay members of Congress or having the Federal Treasury pay them by emphatically stating that there would always be a vote on Congressional pay so members would be individually responsible. As Farrand's Records of the Federal Convention of 1787 lucidly reveal, the founders intended that Congress would always vote on its pay.

As a member of Congress, I want to fulfill my Constitutional responsibility and vote "yes" or "no" on the upcoming 28 percent pay raise proposal. Also, in October 1977, another "automatic" pay raise for members of Congress will come under the annual cost-of-living adjustment. I want to vote on that raise, too.

LARRY PRESSLER,
Member of Congress.

WASHINGTON, D.C.

KOREAN INVOLVEMENT NEEDS INVESTIGATION

HON. JERRY M. PATTERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. PATTERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my support for House Resolution 235, authorizing the Committee on Standards and Official Conduct to investigate the improper influence of Members of Congress by representatives of the government of the Republic of Korea.

I am not making preliminary judgments regarding the guilt or innocence of any person and would not advocate that anyone else do so. I do believe, however, that the allegations that have been made are of such a serious nature that we in the Congress must take immediate action to ascertain the true facts, and if evidence warrants, discipline and punish those involved.

If we fail to act now, in an expeditious manner, we will raise grave doubts in the

public mind over the integrity of this Institution. At this moment we are in the process of writing a most stringent code of ethics. We must not fail to act on this matter which involves possible violations of the law. How can the House of Representatives which so efficiently, fairly, and judiciously investigated violations perpetrated by those involved in the Watergate scandal not have at least equal outrage over allegations of illegal activities involving Members of the House.

I am aware that the Justice Department and the U.S. Attorney's Office are currently conducting their own investigations of the allegations that have been made. My intention in supporting House Resolution 235 is not to deter or divert efforts away from that ongoing investigation. I support that investigation, but I also firmly believe that we in the House of Representatives have a responsibility, in fact an obligation, to enforce our own code of ethics and to demand that the Members of this body obey the law.

The charges involving bribery and influence peddling reach at the very foundations of representative government. We each have been elected and entrusted by our constituents with the duty to represent their concerns and interests. Collectively we must assure that this trust is not abused by unethical or illegal activities by any Member who takes the oath of office.

EPA ACTION IN HALTING AUTOMOBILE PRODUCTION IS PROBABLY UNCONSTITUTIONAL

HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, this morning the Washington Post carried a front page story announcing that the Environmental Protection Agency has ordered an immediate halt to the production of Ford Granadas and Mercury Monarchs, both manufactured by the Ford Motor Co. As I understand the report, about one-third of the entire production line of these cars will be shut down pending modification to their carburetors.

What is disturbing to me is that the laws under which EPA is taking this action might be unconstitutional. It seems that there may be a seventh amendment violation in that the EPA's action amounts to civil fine or penalty without due process. If, in fact, Ford Motor Co. is violating some law, then let the case be handled by the Justice Department and brought before a court of law. Unelected Government bureaucracies should not have the power to step in and shut down an assembly line of a private manufacturing concern.

On the light side, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that EPA's action against Ford Motor Co. had nothing to do with the fact that Henry Ford II recently resigned from the board of the Ford Foundation,

even though the Ford Foundation has been one of the largest financial backers of environmental extremists groups.

FFA—AGRICULTURE'S NEW GENERATION

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, the Future Farmers of America will be celebrating their National Week February 19 to 26 and it is once again a real pleasure for me to salute this unique organization.

FFA is open to any student who is studying vocational agriculture and has grown to a membership of over one-half million young men and women.

The theme for 1977 National FFA Week, "FFA—Agriculture's New Generation," is certainly fitting, for through this outstanding organization our youth prepare themselves to enter an exciting new world of agriculture. They will study the many facets of agriculture such as global expansion, technical advancement, economic strategy, environmental conditions, political confrontation, and consumer education. Through their involvement in these many areas the members of FFA will certainly develop the necessary skills and understanding to successfully meet and deal with the challenges that lie ahead of them in their chosen fields.

Perhaps one of the most challenging and difficult decisions facing the young men and women in FFA, as well as all of our youth today, is the important step of choosing a career. The Future Farmers of America is, no doubt, of great assistance to its members as it offers the opportunity to explore the many areas of agriculture through course work and real life experience.

The FFA principle of learning by doing not only provides an unmatched agricultural education but encourages self-development and responsible leadership, citizenship, and cooperation.

As an organization, the Future Farmers of America have consistently demonstrated their dedication to the production of food and fiber to meet the needs of our Nation and the world. There can be no finer testimony to the success of this organization than the many outstanding agricultural leaders of today.

In Kentucky, as well as many other States, FFA alumni chapters have been organized to support those who will be the next to lead. I take special pride in the many worthy achievements of the Future Farmers in Kentucky and am pleased to note that their membership has risen to a record number of 15,450 individuals.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the Future Farmers of America for they are truly "Agriculture's New Generation" and I offer my best wishes for continued success in all of their future endeavors.

PLAIN TALK ON ENERGY, ENVIRONMENT, AND ECONOMICS

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, the need to synthesize energy, environmental, and economic policy is known to us all. However, few of us have the ability to do this, and we are skeptical of those who claim to possess this ability. The subject is simply too complex and confused to lend itself to easy analysis. In spite of this difficulty, we have to attempt the synthesis, and any help we can get in doing this is welcome.

One of the better writers in this field is Dr. Barry Commoner, who is probably known to every Member of this body. In a recent visit to Los Angeles, Dr. Commoner addressed the Los Angeles County Federation of Labor—AFL—CIO, and also wrote a short article for their publication, the Los Angeles Citizen. Because these two items are short, well written, and address the issues we are grappling with, I would like to share them with my colleagues. I believe this material is a real contribution to the understanding of the problems before us.

The articles follow:

[From The Los Angeles AFL—CIO Citizen, Jan. 7, 1977]

NEW ENERGY POLICY—KEY TO ENDING ECONOMIC WOES

(By Barry Commoner)

No one needs to be told that our cities are in crisis. Each year the quality of urban life becomes worse; the problems multiply; the costs escalate; bankruptcy threatens.

Despite their complexity, nearly all of the cities' chaotic troubles stem from only two, but enormously difficult, economic ones—unemployment and inflation. Lack of work generates most of the human misery that city agencies confront, and the rising cost of living limits what can be done to alleviate it.

But blaming the urban crisis on unemployment and inflation only seem to be the old maneuver of shifting the cities' problems to the federal government, where such economic issues are ordinarily dealt with. It leaves the cities in the familiar and frustrating position of pleading for federal help.

I should like to propose a new idea; that the key to the unemployment and inflation problems is a new energy policy, and that the cities can take the lead in creating it. While it remains true that unemployment and inflation must be curbed in order to solve the cities' problems at their root, this new approach would give the cities a way to tackle these problems on their own initiative.

To see the crucial links that connect energy, unemployment, inflation, and the fate of the cities, we need to know certain basic facts:

Nearly all (96%) of U.S. energy comes from petroleum, natural gas, coal, and uranium. These are nonrenewable resources; they get used up.

Although the supplies of oil, gas and uranium are indeed exhaustible, we are not likely actually to exhaust them. The real trouble with a nonrenewable energy supply is economic. As oil, for example, becomes scarcer, more energy, more capital and other resources need to be invested in producing it, forcing up the price of oil, adding to the rising cost of production, again driving the price of oil upward. So long as we rely on

nonrenewable sources of energy we will run out of our ability to afford it long before we run out of the energy itself.

Every source of energy is useful only after it is transformed into some appropriate form. The cost of the necessary energy-transforming machinery depends on its technological maturity. A nuclear power plant is a new and very complex technology which is still in the process of being redesigned. Because nuclear power plants have had to meet safety and environmental protection requirements that were not anticipated in the original design, their costs have increased by 130% in the last five years, and since waste and reprocessing problems remain unsolved the costs will continue to rise. That explains why nuclear power is the most expensive energy source.

Rising energy prices can only lead to economic disaster. According to conventional wisdom, energy has been "under-priced" and, as the price rises, the "free market" will see to it that less is used. But this conventional view overlooks a basic, overriding fact about energy: Unlike other scarce, high-priced goods (elephant tusks, for example) where it is needed there is no substitute for energy. As a result, as diminishing returns force the price of energy to rise, manufacturers let the increase "pass through" to the price of the goods they produce. Since energy is used to produce all goods and services, this means a general increase in prices. An energy policy that depends on nonrenewable resources and immature technologies means runaway inflation.

Inflation that is driven by the rising price of energy is certain to place the heaviest burden on the poor, the central city dwellers. The necessities of life, which make up most of a low-income budget, have become particularly vulnerable to the rising price of energy. To make matters worse, the use of energy has become grossly inefficient. We pay more for energy and get less out of it.

Because of these trends, the U.S. economy is now in an absolutely unprecedented situation: For the first time in history the relative price of energy is rising at a rapid and continuing rate. In the last 2½ years the price of energy, which in the previous 25 years has been essentially constant relative to general wholesale prices, jumped from an index value of 72 to 106. The rapidly rising price of energy drives all prices upward, creates uncertainties that delay new industrial investments, and forces economic dislocations that cost jobs. It is a prescription for inflation and unemployment.

Here, then, is the real meaning of the energy crisis. It is not the distant prospect of some day running out of energy. Rather, it is the immediate prospect of economic catastrophe.

Although it is convenient to blame the rising price of energy on the OPEC countries, in truth it is the inevitable result of U.S. energy policy.

Every step taken by the Ford Administration in the name of "energy policy" has been a move toward ever higher energy prices: It has attempted to stimulate domestic oil and gas production by means of business "incentives"; to speed the construction of nuclear power plants; to develop shale oil and synthetic fuels. For reasons already given, each of these actions drives the price of energy upward.

This is the energy policy that the new Administration will inherit. It is a policy that is rapidly carrying the country toward economic disaster. Until that policy is changed, there will be no escape from inflation, unemployment and the downward trend of the economy.

Cities are particularly vulnerable to the rising price of energy. If it continues to soar, people in the spread-out municipal areas will be forced to pay ever-increasing costs just to survive—to go to and from work, to

go shopping, to visit the doctor. The rising cost of employees' travel between the suburbs and city businesses will give industry yet another excuse to flee the city.

What can be done? Is the energy crisis just another of the cities' insoluble problems?

Far from it. Once it is seen in its true, economic form, the basic strategy of solving the energy crisis, and the powerful initiative that the cities can take to accomplish it, become clear. The basic strategy is to take advantage of the rapid, unprecedented rise in the price of fuel, which gives a strong economic incentive for investments that cut down the use of fuel. In other words, precisely because our present energy sources have—for good reason—become the leading edge of inflation, an investment that reduces the use of these sources becomes a uniquely effective hedge against inflation.

There are two ways of doing just that, which—unlike offshore oil or nuclear power—can be readily available anywhere in the country: insulation and solar energy.

Here is one example: In the St. Louis area about \$2,000 would be needed to insulate a conventional frame house with no present insulation, saving about \$83 a year in present utility cost. But \$83 will not cover the payment on a \$2,000, 20-year loan. However, since the price of energy is bound to go on rising, in about five years the utility savings will in fact make the \$2,000 investment worthwhile. The problem is that even with good prospects of an eventual net saving, few householders are likely to be in a position to take on such a debt and incur an immediate, if temporary, increase in their operating costs in order to save money in the future.

Solar energy offers a similar protection against inflation. One of the myths about solar energy is that it will be feasible only in the sunniest parts of the country. But the most and least sunny regions differ only by a factor two. Another myth is that it is too expensive. But one important solar technology—the collector—is already economical in many parts of the country, when properly combined with conventional energy sources.

A recent Washington University study showed that a St. Louis homeowner could cut his hot water bill, right now, by installing a solar collector to meet about 46% of the need, the rest being provided by electricity. Although the collector would cost \$660 installed, amortized at 8% bank financing it would still reduce the overall annual total hot water bill by 10%.

Nationwide, 24% of all homes now use electric water heaters, which consume 16% of all residential electricity, second in demand only to refrigeration. By the St. Louis data, these homes could be equipped for about one-half solar water at a total cost of about \$10.5 billion.

As a rough estimate, the nation could produce the same amount of hot water by investing \$10 billion in solar collectors, or in nuclear power plants. But the solar collectors are likely to be much more reliable and certainly much less risky than the nuclear power plants.

These examples show that insulation and heating can be used to counteract rising utility costs, with future, and in some cases present, savings to the householder—if suitable financing can be arranged.

To illustrate what might be accomplished nationally in this way, here is a final example. It is based on President Ford's proposal to invest \$100 billion of public funds to provide private entrepreneurs with capital for energy investments in nuclear power, shale oil and synthetic fuel—all of which would contribute considerably to the rising price of energy. If this money were used instead to provide loans for solar-heat installations (interest-free, but with the recipient required to pay back the annual savings in fuel, reckoned at a fixed, rather than con-

stantly inflating price) after 10 years the following could be accomplished: Most single-family homes and commercial buildings in the United States would be using solar heat for 60% of their space-heating requirements and that part of their heating bill would no longer increase in price; the fuel saved could reduce national oil imports by about 20%; in the tenth year and thereafter, about \$6.5 billion would be paid back to the government annually. With insulation loans added, such a program could be even more effective.

Without more detailed analysis these figures must be regarded as approximate. But they are precise enough to show that the rapidly rising price of conventional energy makes it feasible—in some places immediately and in most of the country within the next few years—to use investments in insulation and solar heat as powerful, cost-effective weapons against inflation. But none of this can happen without some kind of government intervention to facilitate the necessary financing. In return the country would receive very considerable advantages:

First, the soaring cost of energy would begin to be stabilized. To the degree to which insulation and solar devices reduce the consumption of oil, natural gas and nuclear power, the consumer will be freed of constantly rising utility bills.

Second, demand for fuels and electricity would be reduced; this would help to cut back the rate of increase in energy prices and inflation generally.

Third, insulation and solar heating are job-creating programs, involving carpenters, plumbers, electricians, glass workers, sheet-metal workers, and the construction industry as a whole. For example, the \$100 billion 10-year program cited above could probably create nearly a million jobs, or enough to reduce the unemployment rate by one percentage point. And since the work is tied to housing and commercial building, cities, and suburbs would particularly benefit from the new job opportunities.

Fourth, by reducing fuel consumption, the program would diminish air pollution, again especially in the cities.

To implement such a program, what is needed is an agency which, for the sake of these considerable social advantages, would offer loans at favorable financial terms for insulation and solar heating in homes and commercial buildings. In order to match the highly local, decentralized nature of the necessary work, the agency ought to operate on a local, rather than national scale.

What is called for is not some new federal bureaucracy, but rather, in each city or metropolitan region, a kind of Urban Energy Bank, matched in size to the area that it serves and supplied with funds raised either in the bond market, or provided federally (or both). It seems to me that the appropriate administrative base for such an agency is the city.

Beyond the advantages to the cities themselves, such a program would begin to create a sensible national energy program. Previous proposals for a national energy program have been based on huge, costly, centralized facilities.

But now, with a new administration we could do things differently. President-elect Carter has already noted the importance of energy conservation and solar energy, and called for a critical look at the future of nuclear power. More important, he has called on the American people to rely less on the old, centralized bureaucratic attempts to solve their problems, and more on their own creative energy and initiative. Energy policy is a unique opportunity to make a start in this new direction.

The energy crisis creates both the necessity and the opportunity to strike at the

heart of our most disastrous urban and national problems.

It calls for a new energy program that addresses the economic impact of the crisis—inflation and unemployment—and for a new partnership between the people and their government.

It gives the cities the opportunity to lead the way toward these goals.

It gives us all the challenge to restore hope in the cities', and the nation's, future.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Feb. 6, 1977]

SOLAR ENERGY COULD AVERT CRISIS IN SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

(By Barry Commoner)

(NOTE.—Barry Commoner, director of the Center for the Biology of Natural Systems at Washington University, St. Louis, is the author of "Science and Survival" and "The Closing Circle." His latest book is "The Poverty of Power: Energy and the Economic Crisis." This article is adapted from a recent speech at an energy conference of the Los Angeles County Federation of Labor (AFL-CIO).)

Even with their thermostats set at 65 degrees to help conserve natural gas for shivering Easterners, people in California have difficulty visualizing the extent of the energy crisis. But energy problems will increasingly affect the economy of the state, particularly in Southern California.

A report prepared recently by TRW, Inc., for the California Energy Resources Conservation and Development Commission paints a grim picture for Southern California.

Industry, most commercial establishments and homes depend heavily on natural gas.

The supply is dwindling, so that by 1980 natural gas will be denied to some industries and curtailed for residential users.

Any feasible substitute for natural gas, chiefly oil, would worsen the already serious air pollution problem in Southern California. The choices open to industrial managers facing the loss of their essential natural gas supply in the next few years therefore depend on whether they can expect relaxation or stringent enforcement of air quality standards.

If air pollution enforcement is relaxed to allow substitution of a more polluting fuel, the industrial manager will find that the cost of that fuel will determine whether his operation is still profitable. If the industry cannot afford to replace natural gas or to modify its operation, the only alternative is to shut down.

If air pollution enforcement is maintained, the only alternative is to delay action, presumably in the hope that the standards will eventually be relaxed as the threatened shutdown of the industry approaches.

This is a picture of the strategy that industrial management hopes to use to meet the expected depletion of natural gas supplies. The message of industry is clear: Relax pollution standards, or by 1980 industry in Southern California—and a few years later in the rest of the state—will be forced to go elsewhere.

When you examine all the facts about the energy problem, it becomes clear that we do not need to choose between jobs and environmental quality. There is a way to get the needed energy that will protect both the environment and the economy. In fact, a new energy policy that is guided by a proper understanding of efficient energy production and environmental quality is the one sure way to stabilize the economy, to reduce inflation and to increase employment.

The present natural gas supply for Southern California comes by pipeline from fields in Texas and California. It is a limited amount which will eventually "run out." And it is certainly true that substitution of oil for natural gas would worsen pollution; compared to natural gas, oil produces about 15

times more nitrogen oxides, 50 times more particulates, and 1,000 times more sulfur oxides.

With both oil and natural gas, the real problem is the eventual reality of "running out." But what does "running out" of an energy supply really mean? What determines the amount of oil and natural gas that will be produced and how long these supplies will last?

"The U.S. Energy Outlook," published by the National Petroleum Council in 1971, and subsequent Federal Energy Administration studies that were largely based on it, examined the cost of finding and producing the dwindling domestic supplies of oil and natural gas, their selling price, and profitability.

These reports show that if the price of domestic oil were held to \$7 per barrel (in 1973 dollars), U.S. companies would be expected to produce about 70 billion barrels between 1975 and 1988. If the price were allowed to reach \$11, the companies could afford to invest in more intensive exploration efforts and more costly production techniques and could then produce about 80 billion barrels in that period. Thus, the country could have an additional 10 billion barrels of oil—if we were willing to finance the extra production by paying an additional \$390 billion for it. This amounts to \$39 per barrel for the extra oil.

All these calculations are based on meeting the companies' need for profit, usually an expected 15% return on assets. When the price is too low to yield this profit, the companies lack the incentive to find and produce larger amounts of oil and natural gas. In other words, we are not so much running out of gas and oil as we are running out of the corporations' willingness to accept a declining profit, or the country's willingness to accept a higher price.

All this means that the industries of Southern California will "run out" of natural gas and face shutdowns when the price is higher than they are willing to pay. It also means that their willingness to substitute oil or some other fuel, rather than shut down, will depend on the cost of the alternative supply.

Switching to oil cannot solve the economic crisis resulting from the declining supply of natural gas—because oil too is a dwindling resource. Thus, the switch to oil would only worsen the environmental situation, without improving the economic problem—the rising price of fuel—which is the real measure of the economic crisis.

Another possible solution appears at first glance to solve the energy problem in Southern California without worsening air pollution—importing liquefied natural gas (LNG) from Alaska or Indonesia. Again, we must examine the cost of the alternative to decide its feasibility.

The estimated price of LNG delivered to the Los Angeles area is considerably higher than the expected price of domestic natural gas. Moreover, because of its technological immaturity and the anticipated costs of minimizing the huge dangers involved in handling and using it, LNG will become an increasingly costly alternative to domestic natural gas. Like the oil alternative, LNG is not a viable solution.

To see a way out of this dilemma, we must return to the fundamentals of energy production: What we need is energy at a stable cost, and to accomplish this, the source must be renewable (and therefore not subject to diminishing returns) and the technology mature (and therefore not vulnerable to unexpected, increasing costs).

There is, of course, only one renewable energy source available to us—the sun. Can solar energy substitute for the intense use of natural gas in Southern California? Are the available technologies economically competitive and mature?

The answer is yes. Two solar technologies

which are economically competitive with the expected price of natural gas in Southern California and which are technologically mature can already take care of most of the natural gas demand in the area.

The first is the production of methane (the essential ingredient of natural gas) from organic wastes. This is a solar technology because the sunlight that falls on California is photosynthetically transformed by plants into various kinds of organic compounds—cellulose and other constituents of wood, the sugars in fruit and other foods, the protein and fat of meat. All of these materials are easily and efficiently converted to methane, most of them by biological processes that have little or no environmental impact.

The advantages of methane production are many. It would help to reestablish ecological balance in California agriculture, and at the same time reduce agricultural costs, since the residual sludge from this process is an excellent, inexpensive nitrogen-rich fertilizer—which could reduce the present high rate of consumption of inorganic nitrogen fertilizer. Since this fertilizer is made from natural gas, the production of methane would help to relieve the demand for natural gas. Similarly, methane generation is an ideal, ecologically sound way to cope with two major urban problems—disposal of garbage and sewage.

The most important factor, however, is that the methane derived from all these materials, as well as sewage and manure, will constitute a renewable fuel. It will be available in about the same amounts from year to year.

How large are the potential resources for methane production in California? I estimate from the most recent report by J. A. Alich of the Stanford Research Institute that organic wastes now produced annually in California can yield about 200 billion cubic feet of methane. In 1975 this amount of methane would have supplied the needs met by natural gas for all electric power production in California and all of the major industrial uses of natural gas in the Los Angeles metropolitan areas.

But even if the price of solar methane were stable, might it be so high that it would be uncompetitive with the nonrenewable sources, such as LNG (with all the necessary precautions built in and paid for) for a long time?

Cost figures worked out by the RAND Corp. for the production of methane from available organic wastes are in the range of \$1-2 per 1,000 cubic feet. This compares quite favorably with the expected cost of Alaskan LNG, which RAND predicts to be \$1.50-2.25. What about the large capital investment? Methane technologies are simple and mature.

The second method of meeting the coming natural gas crisis in California is the direct use of solar energy for heating now, and for cooling in the not-so-distant future.

One of the unfortunate myths about solar energy is that the necessary technologies are yet to be developed, and are simply too expensive to be practical. But the fact is that solar technology can help significantly and immediately to solve California's natural gas crisis. The simple solar collector, a metal or glass-covered box painted black inside, traps sunlight and converts it to heat, which can then be readily transferred to a moving stream of water or air and used for space heat, or hot water.

A few weeks ago the Energy Resource and Development Administration, which has been no great booster of solar energy, announced the results of a study showing that solar heat is, today, economically competitive with electric heat in a number of cities, including Los Angeles.

What would the widespread use of solar collectors mean for Southern California and the entire state? About 30% of the present uses of natural gas in California are for

space, heat and hot water, 60-70% of which can be handled by ordinary solar collectors. Therefore, substitution of solar heaters would reduce overall demand for natural gas significantly—by about 20% of the present total demand. The main problem to be solved is in financing the initial investment at reasonable interest rates.

Methane production from wastes could meet about 30% of the present natural gas demand, 55% using special fast-growing hardwood crops. Solar collectors for space heat and hot water could meet 20% of the demand. Together, these solar techniques could meet about 75% of the present demand for natural gas. With the addition of fairly simple energy conservation practices, the solar alternative could free California from the threat of economic catastrophe that is inherent in its present dependence on natural gas.

If the serious energy problems of Southern California could be solved by development of solar energy sources, why hasn't this alternative been pursued more vigorously? This is the same question that arises in connection with the absence of a sensible national energy policy.

Until now energy policy has been determined by industrial management. Industrial managers are motivated in the choice of product, the design of production technology, or the choice of fuel, by profitability. The present policies, which are characterized by the rising price of energy, have thus far yielded good profits to management. But these policies are short-sighted. While they have been profitable in the short run, they have led to the economically catastrophic escalation of energy prices. They have left industry, and the workers who depend on it, vulnerable to the disruptive effects of uncertainties in the future supply and price of energy.

It is perhaps not very surprising that industry has so badly mismanaged the energy problem. We already know how poorly industry has handled the environment problem—creating products and production methods that ignored the effects on the environment in the workplace and outside of it. In the terminology of the "free market" these are all considered "externalities." Such externalities affect workers, consumers, and society as a whole, but do not enter into the computation of profit, "the bottom line," until the damage is done and penalties mandated by legislation must be paid.

In this sense, the energy crisis is itself an externality—a fault imposed on society by the failure of the famous "invisible hand" of the free market to govern successfully the national production and use of energy.

Should we expect Washington to do the job? The federal government is accustomed to solutions to externalities—whether unemployment, environmental degradation, or energy problems—that only try to soften the worst symptoms—for example, regulations that attempt to "control" workplace hazards, long after the boardroom decisions that created these hazards in the first place have been made and built into the factory. But there is no way to patch up the energy crisis. It will rapidly turn into an economic disaster unless fundamental steps are taken.

I am convinced that the opportunity for a solar solution is not only technologically and economically sound; it is also politically realistic. President Carter has already emphasized the importance of solar energy and conservation and has been critical of excessive dependence on nuclear power. He has reminded us that we would do better to rely less on highly centralized, federal attempts to solve our problems and more on our own creative efforts and initiative.

The energy problem is a unique and enormously important opportunity to move in this new direction. And one place to start this new movement is right here in Southern California.

QUALITY OF POSTAL SERVICE IN SOUTHEASTERN WISCONSIN COULD STAND IMPROVEMENT

HON. ROBERT W. KASTEN, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. KASTEN. Mr. Speaker, over the past several years, I have become increasingly concerned about the number of complaints from constituents regarding the quality of mail service provided by the U.S. Postal Service.

Last March, I requested that the General Accounting Office study the quality of mail service in the Ninth Congressional District of Wisconsin. The GAO carried out an intensive, 6-month review of mail service policies and procedures, which included observation of processing operations, discussion of problems with local postal officials, and analysis of responses to my questionnaire on the quality of mail service.

In compiling this information, GAO found that the Postal Service in southeastern Wisconsin promises the people much more than it delivers.

DELIVERY OF FIRST-CLASS MAIL

The GAO report stated that the Postal Service measures quality of service primarily in terms of delivery performance on first-class mail, with emphasis on overnight delivery. Postal standards provide for 1-day—overnight—delivery within local areas, 2-day delivery within a 600-mile radius, and 3-day delivery for all other first-class mail. The Service's goal is to meet these standards 95 percent of the time.

According to the GAO report, Postal Service statistics show that first-class mail in southeastern Wisconsin was delivered overnight 97 percent of the time—exceeding the Service's goal of 95 percent. Although promised 2- and 3-day delivery met or exceed national averages, it did not meet the Service's 95 percent goal. The GAO report noted that inconsistency is a major problem, as some southeastern Wisconsin communities receive much better service than others. It also pointed out that in the area as a whole, 4.8 billion pieces of first-class mail are delivered late every year.

OVERNIGHT SERVICE TO 17 CITIES

The GAO report stated that in October of 1975, the Postal Service implemented, on a test basis, the service improvement program, which eliminated airmail and upgraded first-class mail service commitments. Under this program, Milwaukee mail was to receive overnight service to Chicago and 16 other cities. A map was placed in the Milwaukee Post Office promising 95 percent on-time delivery to these 17 areas.

However, GAO investigators found that during one 4-week period, only 40 percent of the mail to Chicago was delivered overnight.

The GAO concluded that unless improvements are made, "postal patrons may in time conclude that the postal service is advertising service that it cannot deliver, causing dissatisfaction and complaints."

SECOND-, THIRD-, AND FOURTH-CLASS MAIL

The GAO was critical of the Postal Service's performance on second-, third-, and fourth-class mail delivery. The report stated that although,

The Service has established delivery standards for these classes of mail, it only measures performance for parcel post. We believe that postal patrons can expect inconsistent delivery service for most second-, third-, and fourth-class mail because it has the lowest priority—it is processed as time allows.

PARCEL POST DELIVERY

GAO investigators also rated the delivery of parcel post packages as inconsistent. During a 7-month period last year, promised overnight delivery was achieved only 83 percent of the time within the Milwaukee area.

The GAO report concluded that customers "have complained of parcel damage, and we believe such complaints have merit." Investigators who observed parcel handling in the Milwaukee Post Office reported that they saw "parcels jammed together on conveyor belts, dropped 12 to 15 inches from one conveyor system to another, smashed at the bottom of long chutes by other parcels, and tossed 5 to 10 feet into pouches." They also noted that parcels marked "fragile" were treated the same as other packages. The study found that over the last 18 months an average of 13,299 parcels per month required rewrapping by the Milwaukee Post Office.

SORTING

GAO investigators found that an average of 1.5 percent of the letters sorted by zip code in the main Milwaukee Post Office were misrouted to their destination within the area studied.

Of the 3,244 letters selected for a survey by GAO, 4.1 percent were incorrectly sorted by zip code. GAO then checked the error rate after 1,391 sorted letters were routinely double checked for accuracy by postal employees, and put in pouches ready for pickup by a mail truck. Two and a half percent of those letters were misrouted.

QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS REVIEWED

To determine the views of postal patrons, GAO reviewed the results of a special Postal Service questionnaire that I had sent to 60,000 residents in the Ninth Congressional District. It also reviewed the complaints received by the Milwaukee Post Office during a recent 6-month period. Of the 4,174 consumer complaint cards filed, about 45 percent were complaints about delivery, primarily late delivery. But 37 percent of the complaints concerned the self-service postal units at shopping malls and similar locations.

GAO found that the main causes of mail delivery problems in southeastern Wisconsin were transportation difficulties—either mechanical or weather related—human error in sorting and dispatching mail, and processing equipment breakdown.

IMPROVING MAIL SERVICE

In a letter to the Postmaster General of the United States, I outlined the problems uncovered by the General Accounting Office investigation and urged that mail service in southeastern Wisconsin be improved. I requested that the Postal

Service stop making promises that it could not keep and stop advertising service that it could not deliver.

In his response to my letter, the Postmaster General, Benjamin Bailar, assured me that several efforts were being taken on both the local and national levels to correct the deficiencies cited by GAO investigators.

He explained that comprehensive analyses have been conducted at all of the bulk mail centers to identify local factors which contribute to damage and delay of packages. Plans for corrective action have been developed and implementation is underway.

On a national scale, Bailar said,

A special management project has been established to review and revise a number of policies and procedures which impact on the effectiveness of bulk mail operations.

In response to customer complaints about self-service postal units, the Postmaster General conceded that "some of the equipment is in need of replacement." Bailar said that steps are currently being taken to replace outdated and malfunctioning self-service postal units.

At my request, the service improvement program map was removed from the lobby of the Milwaukee Post Office. James D. Oster, Milwaukee postmaster, advised me that tests were made to the SIP cities, and as a result adjustments were made to the map to reflect the true facts.

Mr. Oster has said that if and when the Postal Service lives up to its promise of 95 percent ontime delivery to the 17 cities involved, the map will once again be amended.

Through the Federal investigation and with the help of Ninth District residents, we have been able to pinpoint some of the problems and we have taken the first steps toward correcting them. We have a long way to go before the people of Wisconsin receive the efficient postal service they want and deserve. But we have made a start.

I will continue to monitor these corrective efforts to insure that action is taken. We have listened to promises. We now expect results.

The Postal Service provides a prime example of one of the greatest problems Americans face today. Our Government has grown large, unwieldy and undependable; it promises the American people solutions and services that it cannot deliver. This practice cannot continue. We need and deserve a government that promises only what it can deliver, and delivers all that it promises.

LIMIT ON CONGRESSIONAL TERMS

HON. BERKLEY BEDELL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. BEDELL. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a proposed joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to limit and change the terms of Members of Congress.

A Representative's term would be lengthened from the present 2 years to 4, but this resolution provides that no Member—Senator or Representative—can serve more than three consecutive terms. He would have to sit out a 2-year period following his third term before he would be eligible to run again. However, no Representative would be permitted to run for the Senate unless he resigns as a Representative effective January 3 following the date on which such an election is held.

Additionally, my resolution would divide the House of Representatives into two classes so that fully one half of the House is elected every 2 years.

I feel that a term limitation should be imposed on both Houses of Congress, just as we have on the Executive, which would prevent election to office from becoming a way of life, and contributes significantly to the demise of the seniority system.

The proposal which I have offered would allow continued use of the seniority system but the chain of seniority would be broken and this would permit greater flexibility in congressional leadership.

What the House needs badly is more turnover. It does not need a revolution every 2 years, but it does need a steady flow of new people, people who are fresh from their communities, people who will approach issues and problems with logic and imagination. It is precisely these kind of men and women, swept into office by the impact of Watergate and the economic downturn, who are reforming the House today.

WORLD WAR I PENSION ACT

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, veterans of World War I deserve an increase in their pensions. This Nation has provided too little to the veterans of World War I. For this reason I have cosponsored the World War I Pension Act, which will provide a \$150 monthly pension to veterans of World War I or their spouses.

Unlike a veteran of a later war, the World War I veteran received no GI educational benefits. There was too little effort to aid these veterans in finding employment, nor was there a GI home loan program. Veterans hospitals like those of today were unheard of in the days of World War I veterans. Further, the social security system, which was created in 1935, did not aid most World War I veterans as they were already too old to build up maximum benefits.

Clearly, the veterans of World War I have been neglected. The World War I Pension Act would serve to partially compensate the veterans of World War I who are eligible for the wide range of benefits available to veterans of later wars.

Presently there are 834,000 surviving World War I veterans—94,000 less than at this time last year. The pension increase

should get to the deserving World War I veterans now.

AN EXAMPLE TO US ALL

HON. DAVE STOCKMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Speaker, on occasion, one among us who is touched cruelly by the hand of fate rises to meet the challenge in a way that can serve as an example to us all. Tim Messner of Constantine, Mich., is such a person. The ongoing struggle he faces as he tries to regain the use of his limbs after a serious accident is a demonstration of what the human spirit can accomplish. The role of his family in helping him back to health is a demonstration of the continuing vitality and importance of the family to our American way of life. I insert in the RECORD an article, which appeared in the Kalamazoo Gazette, describing Tim's recovery at this point:

[From the Kalamazoo (Mich.) Gazette, Jan. 22, 1977]

CONSTANTINE ATHLETE WINNING HIS TOUGHEST TRIAL

(By Del Newell)

CONSTANTINE.—Tim Messner ranks right up with Constantine High School's finest all-around athletes.

A fierce competitor, he quarterbacked the football team, was the leading scorer as a senior in basketball and also participated in golf and track.

He met many challenges in the athletic arena—and conquered almost all of them.

Today, however, he's facing his biggest challenge. One that can't be overcome by throwing a long touchdown pass or swishing a jump-shot in the final seconds of a basketball game.

Tim, now 25, is battling back from a terrifying snowmobile accident that occurred three years ago, a mishap that threatened his life, left him paralyzed and had neurosurgeons shaking their heads, sadly announcing to his family, "You may never see Tim move any more than he is right now."

Tim at the time experienced no feeling. The snowmobiling accident had fractured some of his vertebrae and left his spinal cord looking like an "S." He was lucky to even be alive, so doctors said.

Tim, at the time of the accident, had been working in a bank in Shipshewana, Ind. Married for two years, his future looked bright. He was being groomed to become a branch manager.

"It will be 36 months, come Feb. 10, since the accident happened," Tim said recently.

On that day Tim and his brother Mike, currently a teacher and coach at Constantine and another of the school's former prep standouts, were snowmobiling on the track at the high school.

Tim went up a steep embankment attempting to depart the run site. While going down the other side he was thrown from the vehicle, sailed through the air and crashed head-on with sickening force into a light tower 30 feet away.

"I remember waking up and my machine was sitting next to me idling. It was strange. But I couldn't move or feel anything.

"Mike came along soon and when I continued to be unable to feel anything he called an ambulance and I was taken to Bronson Hospital in Kalamazoo," said Tim.

There the extent of the damage was discovered. The spinal cord had been severely pinched and vertebrae damaged. He spent 12 hours in surgery to correct the damage, which included having bone scraped from his hip and being used to form a protective splint to reshape his neck.

Hours later, more trouble developed. His neck began swelling. "It swelled up to 27 inches," mentioned Tim. "And that's bad."

Tim lost all feeling. His blood supply from the neck area to the brain was being cut off. He was whisked back into surgery, this time for a 10-hour operation.

For 13 days after that he had no feeling. He was to spend the next 38 days in Bronson Hospital.

Slowly feeling returned in the upper torso. "But doctors told me that they could have cut me in half with a chain saw and I wouldn't have felt a thing," said Messner of those bleak days.

"Then I was able to move my big toe," says Tim proudly. "But doctors told my family there was maybe a 10 per cent chance that I would some day be able to sit up. That was about it."

But Tim, through the efforts of neurosurgeons such as Naim Koymen and Robert Fabi of Kalamazoo, Constantine's local physician Ray Zimont, and therapist Mike Mullin, was soon to make a miraculous comeback.

"I went to the Southwestern Michigan Rehabilitation Center in Battle Creek and soon they began to have me work with weights. Sixty-three days after entering, I was able to walk out, with crutches, of course."

Today, Tim, showing the same competitive zeal that made him a top-notch athlete as a prep, is continuing to battle back. So much progress has been made, in fact, that doctors have called it a "miracle."

"Dr. Koymen sat down and cried for 15 minutes when I walked into his office for the first time," said Tim. "He had never had a patient (in Tim's condition) able to walk again."

Tim today can walk short distances unaided, although he still has to use crutches most of the time. "The next step is using two canes, then one and then walking unaided," mentioned Tim.

"Muscle spasms are my biggest problem right now. I've fallen twice recently and hit my head on our coffee table. I'm getting tired of that."

Tim's not getting tired of the tedious routine of trying to return his body and limbs to a state of near normalcy, however. "My therapist doesn't want to see me anymore. He said I've gone way beyond what he ever expected," said Tim proudly.

"I was in probably the best shape of my life when the accident happened. I had been lifting weights and running. That helped my recovery."

Tim also credits his family with brightening his outlook and helping, both physically and psychologically, during the dark days of recovery and rehabilitation.

"My family visited me and massaged me and helped with my exercises all 101 days that I was hospitalized," said Tim. Ellene, his bride now of five years, was especially a help during the troubled times.

Mike and his wife, Cheryl, Tim's father and mother, Ray and Betty, and sister Melissa, plus the grandparents and many others in the closely-knit family all rallied to his side.

Tim last summer moved into a new home, built by his father, and he's becoming a familiar figure in the community driving a special-equipped golf cart.

"I can drive a car again now. But I still spend a lot of time in a wheelchair. The spasms are the big thing now," reflects Tim. "If they would stop I could be close to normal again very soon."

"Progress is still slow, never rapid," sighs Tim. "But when I look back to the way I was, then I do see the changes."

"I met a man who had a similar type of injury as mine. He was in a wheelchair for over 6½ years. Nine years after he was hurt, however, he's able to walk down a street and no one would know he was ever paralyzed. I'm way ahead of him."

SUPPORT CONTINUES TO GROW FOR MANDATORY SENTENCING BILL

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, on January 19 of this year I reintroduced legislation with 75 cosponsors that would provide for a minimum mandatory prison sentence for anyone convicted of committing a Federal crime with the use of a firearm.

As of today, the total of cosponsors is 100 and building with each passing day. We have recognized the urgency and the need to come to grips with this problem.

Mr. Speaker, I include in this RECORD several letters from county sheriffs, and law enforcement officials from my State of California.

I urge those colleagues who have as yet not cosigned this bill to do so. For us to sit idly while criminals cause law-abiding citizens to fear for their safety is an abdication of our responsibility and trust as elected representatives of the people.

Mr. Speaker, the letters follow:

SHERIFF-CORONER-PUBLIC ADMINISTRATOR,

Placerville, Calif., February 2, 1977.

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ANDERSON: I have looked into your bill, H.R. 1559, with a great deal of enthusiasm and I feel that it is a realistic approach to curb violence in the United States, and certainly hope your colleagues in congress will support it.

For the past twelve years I have been in public service, and I have heard and read a lot of rhetoric on how to reduce crime and prevent violence—and I feel that you have taken a sound approach to the problem. After all it is not the gun that kills and maims people, but the person who is holding it.

I wish you much success in the future, please keep me posted.

Sincerely,

RICHARD F. PACILEO,
Sheriff-Coroner-Public Administrator.

CITY PROSECUTING ATTORNEY,

Long Beach, Calif., January 25, 1977.

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ANDERSON: Your letter of January 12, 1977, to Mr. Leonard Putnam, City Attorney, transmitting a copy of your bill, H.R. 1559, has been forwarded to this office since we are responsible for prosecuting misdemeanors occurring within the City of Long Beach.

It is my opinion that this bill is a sensible approach to controlling the use of firearms by criminals since it makes imprisonment mandatory where a firearm is used in the commission of a felony. I am convinced that mandatory imprisonment is a deterrent to

criminal acts, and it is this certainty of imprisonment which will deter criminals from using firearms.

If this office can be of further assistance in supporting this bill, please do not hesitate to call on me.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT W. PARKIN,
City Prosecutor.

SACRAMENTO SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT,

Sacramento, Calif., January 28, 1977.

CONGRESSMAN GLENN M. ANDERSON,
Congress of the United States, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ANDERSON: Thank you for supplying me with a copy of your proposed legislation to amend Chapter 44 of the Title 18 of the U.S. Code.

This is exactly the type of legislation we need to enable us to remove violent offenders from our communities. I am convinced that the bill's provision for graduated sentences for subsequent convictions and its prohibitions against suspended, probationary, and concurrent sentences will cause a marked reduction in the number of felonies perpetrated with firearms. Our California Legislature recently enacted a mandatory sentencing law with the same general purpose.

The surest way to reduce the incidence of violent crime is to insure swift and adequate punishment. Violent offenders must be deterred by making the penalty for crime greater than the reward obtained from it.

I sincerely appreciate your asking for my comments on this issue. On behalf of law enforcement officers everywhere, I commend you for seeking the counsel of those who must deal with crime everyday, when and where it occurs.

Very truly yours,

DUANE LOWE,
Sheriff.

SHERIFF-CORONER DEPARTMENT,

Santa Ana, Calif., January 26, 1977.

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON,
Member of Congress,
Long Beach, Calif.

DEAR GLENN: Pursuant to your request dated January 12, 1977 to provide you with our thoughts on H.R. 1559, which is essentially the control, use and sentencing of criminals who use firearms during the commission of a felony, the following comments are offered:

The bill, as we understand it, increases the penalties for the use of, or carrying of firearms during the commission of a felony.

In addition, the prescribed penalties are predetermined and are specific in nature and will be consistent regardless of the judicial district.

As law enforcement officers, we are in favor of gun control, but not to the extent that such controls will infringe on the rights of citizens to keep and bear arms. House Resolution 1559, as we see it, puts gun control in its proper perspective, in that the bill is directed toward those persons who use firearms to violate the law and further mandates specific penalties be given to those violators.

In conclusion, we fully support your effort in helping make our community a safer place to live through effective legislation.

Very truly yours,

BRAD GATES,
Sheriff-Coroner.

SHERIFF-CORONER,

Visalia, Calif., January 21, 1977.

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ANDERSON: Reference is made to your bill, HR 1559, calling for a mandatory five-year penalty for anyone convicted of

using a firearm during the commission of a Federal crime. I have always been of the opinion that the best remedy for controlling the use of firearms is a stringent penalty which is applied over and above the penalty for the crime and which cannot be mitigated by suspension or probation. Your bill includes all of these elements and, therefore, I heartily endorse it and wish you the best of luck with its passage.

Cordially,

BOB WILEY,
Sheriff-Coroner.

**PUBLIC WORKS BILL FORMULA
NEEDS TO BE REVIEWED AND
REVISED**

HON. JIM SANTINI

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. SANTINI. Mr. Speaker, the Governor of the State of Nevada, Mike O'Callaghan, recently testified before the Senate Public Works Committee on the Local Public Works Capital Development and Investment Act of 1976.

Nevada counties in sore need of Federal funding were left short and empty-handed because of the formula used by the EDA to distribute the title I funding. I insert the remarks of our Governor at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a reminder of the necessity to review and revamp the present formula.

REMARKS OF GOVERNOR MIKE O'CALLAGHAN,
GOVERNOR OF NEVADA

TITLE I, LOCAL PUBLIC WORKS CAPITAL DEVELOPMENT AND INVESTMENT ACT OF 1976

In Nevada, more than 120 projects exceeding \$110 million were submitted to the Economic Development Administration for funding under the Local Public Works Capital Development and Investment Program. EDA accepted 106 applications for ranking from Nevada, totalling \$98,709,785. It selected only 16 of these, in the amount of \$10,102,298, subject to final clearance.

Ten million dollars may seem like a considerable amount of money. However, given the way that EDA has spread these funds and the 11 to 1 ratio of requests to available funds, it is my opinion that this program has had very little impact on either unemployment or on solving the priority construction projects of state and local governments.

As you know, projects were first placed in three categories—1) those where the unemployment rate exceeded 7.4 percent, 2) those where the unemployment rate was between 6.5 percent and 7.4 percent, and 3) those where the unemployment was below 6.5 percent. Seventy percent of the funds made available were to go to the first category and the balance to the second and third categories; however, preference was to be given the second.

Projects were then ranked in each category on the basis of the combined score for the number of unemployed, unemployment rate, level of income and the cost per person-month of employment. Additional points were given to projects which were sponsored by general-purpose units of local government. Although this seemed like a logical way to evaluate projects, I would like to describe what happened in Nevada.

EDA accepted and processed one State application for the Southern Nevada Correctional Center located in Clark County. According to EDA, this project received a score of 70.9 and was ranked 60th in the 70 percent

category. The unemployment in the project area was 9.0 percent during the months of July, August and September, 1976. However, EDA required state projects to use total statewide unemployment figures. In Nevada, this meant using a 7.7 percent rate rather than the local unemployment figures for the area where the project was to be constructed.

This, in my opinion, was a major reason why this project was not funded. It appears to contradict the purpose of this legislation, which is to provide "employment opportunities in areas of high unemployment through the expeditious construction or renovation of useful public facilities." Requiring the state to use statewide figures for unemployment, instead of the local figures for the area where the project was to be constructed, placed the State in an unfair position. The fact is that State-initiated projects can create local jobs in the same way as locally-initiated projects.

In addition to ranking projects in the state, EDA established a maximum dollar amount for each county. This maximum amount, or benchmark, was based on the number of unemployed in the county compared to the state total unemployed. The ratio of local to state total unemployment, multiplied by the total local Public Works dollars available to the State, yielded the benchmark for each county.

Douglas County, for example, had a benchmark of \$206,776. This county, with an unemployment rate of 6.7 percent, was funded for a \$1,058,500 project. Douglas County, also had the highest 1974 per capita income in the state, according to the U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis. The per capita income in this county was 29 percent above the national average. Although EDA weighed the level of income, there was not enough consideration given to this factor since White Pine County which is 7 percent below the national average did not receive any funds.

In White Pine County, eligible applicants submitted two projects for a total of \$9,470,636. The County had an unemployment rate of 22.3 percent during the months of June, July and August, 1976. According to the Nevada Department of Employment Security, this unemployment rate was the highest of any county in the state. Furthermore, White Pine County's extremely high unemployment rate was the direct result of action by the Environmental Protection Agency in forcing the closure of the smelter operations of Kennecott Mining Corporation which is the largest employer in the County.

In determining where to use Federal funds to ease unemployment, the Economic Development Administration gave no consideration to the fact that the unusually high unemployment in White Pine County was directly caused by another Federal agency. As a result, the projects for this county and city were not funded.

I realize it is hard to select projects and still stay within the benchmark. However, if this had been done in Clark County, which would have been possible, funds for White Pine County could have been made available. The benchmark for Clark County was established by EDA at \$5,861,000. However, EDA funded projects in the amount of \$6,276,000, exceeding the benchmark by \$415,000. Although this may seem like a small amount, this \$415,000 could have been made available to White Pine County to help alleviate the Federally-caused 22.3 percent unemployment.

The history of one Nevada project which was subsequently rejected for funding should be of interest to you. The county was required to have the project approved by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare before submission to EDA. The documentation for this was not submitted, and EDA should have rejected the application according to its own regulations.

EDA did not do this, but instead relied upon a verbal approval from a HEW official who did not have the authority to grant

such approval. The project was selected by EDA for funding and the error was not discovered until after the announcement was made. Then, EDA aggravated the situation by giving the county six working days to comply with the original submission requirement.

During these six days, my staff was told the project was approved, then denied, several times. In fact, I was personally advised within the space of six hours that the project was approved then that it was denied. In all my years of government, I have never seen such a case of mishandling of a project, much less an entire program.

I know Congress must be well intentioned when it overrode the Presidential veto. However, without a major rewrite of the legislation, as well as a thorough investigation of the way in which the administering agency handled this program, it is my conviction the experiences I have just conveyed will only be repeated. I, therefore, urge your opposition to the request for additional funding for Title I of the Public Works Act.

If the program must be continued, I would urge that the following amendments be included in the Act: (1) funds should be set aside for each area of a state that has a major unemployment problem as determined by the State, not EDA, (2) the elected officials in that area should determine which projects will be constructed within the funding limitations established by EDA, and (3) a certain amount of funds should be set aside for use by each State in those high unemployment areas where the regular allocation procedures do not reflect the unique unemployment situations that exists in each state.

**STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE
JOHN M. MURPHY ON A BILL TO
PROMOTE THE ORDERLY DEVELOPMENT
OF HARD MINERAL
RESOURCES IN THE DEEP SEABED**

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to promote the orderly development of hard mineral resources in the deep seabed. Known as deep seabed mining or ocean mining legislation, this bill is one of the most significant pieces of legislation to be considered by the 95th Congress. It is a reasonable and balanced effort to establish a licensing and regulatory system which will provide the Federal Government, acting in behalf of all the American people, an opportunity to protect the interest of American mining companies in international waters. It will establish a sound investment climate in which such companies will be willing to expedite the exploration and commercial recovery of important mineral nodules.

Manganese nodules are small potato-sized objects approximately one-fifteenth centimeters in diameter and average 5 centimeters across. The ocean floors around the world are literally covered with nodules in some areas, primarily the Pacific, Atlantic, and Indian Oceans. The mining industry estimates that there is approximately \$3 trillion worth of nickel, manganese, cobalt, and copper present in the nodules, which are located at depths of over 12,000 feet.

In the last 15 years, the industry has spent over \$100 million researching methods of recovering and processing the nodules. Although the existence of hard minerals on the deep seabed was discovered in the last quarter of the 19th century, their recovery has been delayed until this time because of the lack of technology and the excessive cost of recovery.

In addition to the dollar value of these nodules, there is a more compelling reason for the United States to encourage the development of this industry. The Department of the Interior has estimated that our current dependence on foreign sources of manganese, copper, nickel, and cobalt can be vastly reduced, if not totally eliminated, by 1990. Instead of importing 82 percent of our manganese needs, we could be virtually independent by 1990, and we could become totally independent in terms of nickel, copper, and cobalt, whereas we now import 82 percent of our nickel, 5 percent of our copper, and 77 percent of our cobalt. These are important minerals, and a valuable lesson can be learned from our dependence on foreign oil.

The advances made by the major American mining companies is impressive, to say the least. They have identified nodule deposits which could provide satisfactory mine sites. They have largely solved the metallurgical problems of winning metals from nodules. They have developed mining systems which have progressed from the drawing board and computer stage and away from simple laboratory tests to large scale at-sea experimentation. In general, there is no longer any doubt about the technical and economic feasibility of ocean mining.

The problem is the present lack of a stable national or international legal and political climate. Further investments in this important area will not be forthcoming unless the U.S. Congress takes action during this session to provide stability and predictability with respect to ocean mining operations.

In the last few years the argument has been made by many observers and by the recent administration that the Congress should allow the Law of the Sea Conference to negotiate an international agreement regarding deep ocean minerals. As we all know, however, the conference has been unable to reach any sort of definitive agreements with respect to a variety of issues and most particularly with respect to the issue of ocean mining. Even proposals put forward by Secretary Kissinger, during the most recent sessions in New York, were not accepted by the Third World countries. And, in my judgment, the Secretary was providing far too many concessions to make such proposals consistent with American national interest.

The underdeveloped countries continue to argue that the resources of the deep seabed are the "common heritage of mankind" and should not be exploited for the sole benefit of countries which have developed the high level of technology necessary for deep seabed mining. This, on the surface, sounds like an honorable goal. But it is clearly necessary to strike a more equitable balance between the

developed and underdeveloped countries. Otherwise, any international seabed regime will find that no one is willing to develop the technology needed.

I have been particularly concerned about the State Department's position on this issue. They have not embarked on a course of rational negotiations, but on a course of preemptive concessions. The Department has repeatedly yielded to the underdeveloped countries in a headlong rush, and almost masochistic effort, to reach a settlement.

It is time for the Congress to act. While we have been waiting for some action by the State Department under the old administration, and while the industry has slowed down its pace, foreign competitors are rushing to catch up with the United States. Congress can no longer sit back and watch this erosion of our technical lead. We can no longer sit back and watch the State Department bargain away U.S. interests. We can no longer sit idly and watch as a secure source of minerals evaporates before our eyes. We must enact legislation into law to enable the U.S. ocean mining industry to proceed with the development of their technology in the recovery of manganese nodules.

There has been a great deal of discussion among knowledgeable people about the impact that deep seabed mining legislation would have on the Law of the Sea Conference. It is my conviction that such legislation, enacted into law at the earliest possible moment, is now the only way the Law of the Sea Conference can be spurred to a successful conclusion if, indeed, that is possible at all. Let me hasten to add, however, that not just any deep seabed mining legislation will contribute to the success of the conference. The underdeveloped countries must understand and be convinced that the United States is ready, willing, and able to mine the minerals of the seabed in the absence of an agreement at the conference. Any legislation which fails to deliver that message will hurt the conference because it will give the developing countries reason to think that the United States is afraid to go forward on its own and will therefore rely only on its negotiating option for as long as the conference lasts. Should this happen, our negotiators, despite their best efforts, will return with a treaty that will not command even a majority in this Congress.

Consequently, legislation will be necessary anyway. But, in this instance, the legislation may come too late, and our mining companies may abandon their investments rather than go deeper into debt. On the other hand, other industrialized countries like Japan, the Federal Republic of Germany, and the United Kingdom will not let their companies go under. We see increasing signs that these countries are actively subsidizing their companies to insure the future technological capability to mine the deep seabed. In other words, should our companies falter, there are others waiting in the wings to take up the lead.

The legislation that I have introduced does not follow the subsidy approach of these other countries. Rather, it tries to provide a stable investment climate to

encourage a free and competitive atmosphere for American ocean mining companies who, I believe, will flourish in such an atmosphere without the need for subsidies.

I have reached the conclusion that the type of ocean mining legislation that I have introduced is essential for the future of the Law of the Sea Conference for the following reasons.

First, the third world erroneously believes that American priorities in this conference center around our military interest in freedom of navigation. They therefore feel that if they wait long enough we will eventually make further concessions on economic and natural resource issues in the interest of obtaining our military objectives.

Second, during recent years, the third world has watched the United States make concession after concession in these negotiations while those countries have made none. Each time an impasse is reached in the negotiations, we have capitulated.

Third, the underdeveloped countries, with the exception of only a few, have a broad ideological interest in deep seabed mining which is part and parcel of the north/south dialog. There is no reason to think that the Law of the Sea Conference, which is the leading edge of that iceberg, is the place the third world will make major compromises.

Fourth, most third world countries are now convinced that with the growth of customary law favoring a 200-mile economic zone, they can have what they want along their coasts without restrictions imposed on them by a treaty. In other words, they simply have no motivation to compromise their ideological positions on deep seabed mining because they feel that they are going to have plenary jurisdiction in the 200-mile economic zone.

There has been some debate in the Congress about alternative legislative approaches which would give American companies loan guarantees for the purpose of pursuing the necessary phase of prototype scale-up and testing during the next 3 years. Such legislation would not allow a company to register a claim to a mine site nor would it protect the \$700 million each company will invest during the next 3 to 5 years.

Under that approach, a treaty could be negotiated in 3 years which would, in practical terms, expropriate the total investment of each of the companies that had been active. This approach simply cannot work.

It will be seen by the underdeveloped countries as another State Department trick played on Congress. The administration for years has been saying to Congress, "wait for the next session of the Law of the Sea Conference and do not pass legislation." If the Department of State now comes to us with legislation which does not grant companies the right to mine the sites they have spent millions exploring, nor provide investment guarantees in the event of a treaty expropriation, the Third World will see such legislation as a State Department attempt to pacify a restless Congress.

We will be used as foils for American negotiators and the Third World will see that they have at least another 3 years to negotiate for more concessions before Congress takes the issue up again.

The worst thing Congress can do now, indeed, the worst service that we could do to our negotiators would be to pass legislation that the Third World would feel was no threat to their guerrilla tactics in this new kind of bloodless warfare between the rich and the poor. I have no doubt that all of us in Congress would rather see the oceans governed by a written body of law than to run the risk of uncertain and possibly conflict-producing practices. But, sometimes it is necessary to take interim steps to bring about a constructive and useful result. Unless we take such steps, the Law of the Sea Conference will continue endlessly; our negotiating position will erode; our ocean mining companies will give up their technology to other countries who are prepared to subsidize their long-term interest and an independent source of materials; and the American people will be the losers.

We in Congress can prevent that happening and, at the same time, enhance the chance for the success of the treaty negotiations. But we will not convince our friends, whose support we need, and our adversaries, who must compromise, if they see this new American Government back away from the hard decisions incumbent on us to protect our national interest. The bill that I have introduced, a summary of which is attached to this statement, is a reasonable and balanced approach to the necessary stable political and investment climate for American mining companies and, at the same time, avoiding unnecessary and expensive subsidies to such companies. It is an interim program, which will be phased out upon successful completion of the Law of the Sea Treaty which is ratified by and binding upon the United States. I urge my colleagues to give prompt and serious consideration to this important legislation. I include the following:

SUMMARY OF H.R. A BILL TO PROMOTE THE ORDERLY DEVELOPMENT OF HARD MINERAL RESOURCES IN THE DEEP SEABED

(Introduced by Mr. Murphy (New York))

The bill establishes a licensing and regulatory system, applicable to United States individuals and business entities, to promote the orderly development of deep seabed hard minerals, found in the manganese nodules located on the seabed beyond the resource jurisdiction of any nation.

The bill establishes licensing procedures to be administered by the secretary of commerce and provides for the issuance of licenses for exploration and commercial recovery of the minerals. No commercial recovery may be authorized prior to January 1, 1978, and, after that date, no commercial recovery may be undertaken under a license except after a specific permit for that commercial recovery is granted. Eligible applicants are entitled to a license from the secretary upon meeting certain requirements and tendering a license fee to be prescribed by the secretary in his regulations. The fee may be no more than \$100,000, and shall reflect the administrative costs of processing the license application.

The secretary is required to establish environmental criteria and standards under which license operations shall be conducted, and the issuance of the license is designated

as a major federal action, as that term is used in the national environmental policy act, and the attendant requirements of that act relating to environmental impact statements are applicable.

The public is guaranteed access to certain information furnished by the applicant, so that it may evaluate and comment upon applications.

During the exploration activities under a license, certain minimum expenditures are required of the applicant, and at the time that a permit for commercial recovery is issued, the licensee must relinquish a designated part of the licensed bloc. Prior to the issuance of the permit for commercial recovery, the secretary is required to review the previous environmental impact statement and to refine it and bring it up to date in relation to prospective commercial recovery activities. In this regard, and state in which a part of the commercial recovery activities is located, specifically the processing activities, will be involved, pursuant to the provisions of the coastal zone management act.

If and when an international regime is agreed upon, which is ratified by and becomes binding upon the United States, no further licenses will be issued under the act, and to the extent that the international regime permits it, the United States is required to sponsor applications from licensees under this act for licenses under the international regime. In addition, should the international regime differ from the provisions of this act so that a licensee suffers a measurable loss of investment, that licensee is entitled to compensation from the United States for the loss. The compensation is to be limited to actual equipment and facilities utilized for exploration purposes at a licensed block and, after a permit for commercial recovery has been issued, shall also include loss of investment in equipment and facilities utilized for commercial recovery and processing. Research and evaluation costs of technology are not compensable. The amount of compensation will be determined in judicial proceedings in the appropriate United States district court.

The minerals recovered from the deep seabed are to be treated under export control laws, customs laws, tax laws and trade laws of the United States as if they had been recovered in the United States. Therefore, for instance, if export licenses are required for similar minerals recovered within the United States, they will also be required for those recovered under a license issued pursuant to this act. In connection with shipping laws, relating to the documentation and privileges of vessels, all vessels engaged in development activities at a licensed block and on vessels engaged in the transportation of minerals to or from the licensed block and a point in the United States shall be considered to be engaged in coastwise trade. Such trade is restricted to vessels of the United States. The minerals, recovered under the authority of the license, will be processed in the United States, or on board U.S. vessels.

The bill also recognizes the possibility of "reciprocating states", as designated by the

President. These would include states with laws similar to the provisions of this act and willing to recognize, on a mutual basis, licenses issued under this act, and under the laws of the reciprocating state. The bill also recognizes the existence of consortium arrangements. Where any such consortium, involving a United States entity, qualifies as a licensee under this act, provisions of the act relating to a compensation for loss of investment and to the applicability of United States export, customs, tax and trade laws will be limited to that proportion of the consortium owned by the United States entity or entities.

The bill provides for both civil and criminal penalties, assessed on a continuing basis, for violations of the act or rules of regulation issued by the Secretary in implementation thereof.

No person subject to the jurisdiction of the United States may engage directly or indirectly in the exploration for, or commercial recovery of, hard mineral resources of the deep seabed except pursuant to the act, pursuant to a license issued by a reciprocating state, or pursuant to the provisions of an international agreement which becomes binding upon the United States.

THE BALANCE(S) OF POWER—PART V (I-A): U.S. ARMY FORCE DESIGN: ALTERNATIVES FOR FISCAL YEARS 1977-81

HON. JOHN BRECKINRIDGE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. Mr. Speaker, while wars are fought with weapons of varying degrees of complexity, the ultimate component of fighting strength remains the individual who wields the weapon. It is with this concept in mind that we examine the problems that face both ourselves and our adversaries in seeing how the manpower problem facing the Armed Forces is solved.

The solutions of the United States and the Soviet Union are considerably different. Today's selection examines how the U.S. Army is attempting to meet the military requirements placed upon it within the fundamental constraints of budgetary limitations and the all-volunteer environment in an open society.

I do not argue that the system we are now using will meet the defense needs of the United States. It may, but then again, it may not. Such an assessment is largely dependent upon a fluid international situation—a situation to which we must be prepared to respond on relatively short order.

The information follows:

U.S. ARMY FORCE DESIGN: ALTERNATIVES FOR FISCAL YEARS 1977-81

TABLE 1.—U.S. Army force structure and manpower levels—Selected years

	End of Fiscal Year				
	1965	1968	1974	1975	1976
Active Army divisions.....	16	19 $\frac{3}{4}$	13	14	16
Active military manpower (thousands).....	969	1,570	783	785	785
Number of soldiers per division* (thousands).....	60.6	79.8	60.2	56.1	49.1

* The increase in this ratio during the Vietnam war years reflects an expansion of training and logistical support units needed in wartime, but not necessary to maintain Army forces in peacetime.

THE ARMY'S ROLE IN NATIONAL SECURITY

Maintaining peace is one of the central objectives of U.S. foreign policy and, as an instrument of the defense establishment, the Army's role is to support that policy. Its forces are to be prepared for the contingencies thought most likely to occur in order to deter potential adversaries and to defeat them, should deterrence fail. However, the specific contingencies that may threaten the peace or other U.S. interests are not clearly foreseen. And, it is difficult to know how Army warfighting capabilities and peacetime deployments contribute to the achievement of foreign policy goals.

These uncertainties pervade force calculations for the entire military establishment, but they create particular difficulties in determining the size of general purpose forces, of which the Army is a part. In the Army's case, great uncertainties arise, first, from the variety of contingencies for which ground forces might be prepared (many of which would require very different kinds of forces); and, second, from the difficulty of measuring whether a given force structure is sized properly to control the worst threat.

Different kinds of contingencies require different kinds of combat formations. U.S. armored divisions, for example, are well suited to war in central Europe or the Middle East, but are virtually useless in jungle-infested regions of the world. Similarly, light infantry and airmobile units are effective in places like Southeast Asia, but would be vulnerable in desert warfare. Since organization, equipment and training once implemented are not readily changed, the choice of contingencies for which the Army prepares is an important long-term decision.

U.S. ground forces are sized, equipped and positioned to respond to three general contingencies:

Warsaw Pact Invasion of Western Europe. For this purpose, the Army maintains four armored and mechanized divisions in Germany, and five armored and mechanized divisions in the United States. In addition, three of the eight National Guard divisions are armored or mechanized. Thus, the total number of heavy divisions available for NATO defense is 12.

Invasion of South Korea. The Army maintains one infantry division in Korea and one infantry division in Hawaii. The Marine Corps deploys one division partly in Okinawa and partly in Hawaii.

Lesser Contingencies Elsewhere. Forces for this purpose would be drawn from the strategic reserve units maintained in the United States for reinforcement of NATO or South Korea as well as lesser contingencies. These forces consist of two active and one reserve Marine divisions, and five active and five reserve Army divisions (infantry, airborne, or airmobile). The Defense Department considers this force adequate to respond to either an attack on NATO and a simultaneous lesser contingency elsewhere, or an attack in South Korea and a lesser contingency elsewhere. It does not consider the force adequate to respond to an attack in South Korea and on NATO simultaneously.¹

The major contingency against which the Army plans is the possibility of large-scale war in central Europe. U.S. and NATO strategy is based on forward defense, with units in position in West Germany to defend against a ground attack by the Warsaw Pact nations. The likelihood of a successful defense should war break out depends upon the amount of advance warning of an impending attack, the speed with which the

United States and its NATO allies reinforce units already in position, and the uncertainty surrounding the use of tactical nuclear weapons.

There is some disagreement about the relevance of elaborate planning for NATO defense against Soviet ground attack. It is sometimes argued that the critical deterrent to Soviet attack in Europe is the prospect of U.S. nuclear retaliation—not NATO ground forces. This view would also permit an emphasis on seapower in view of growing Soviet naval capability, and organization of general purpose forces to project significant ground forces ashore in other parts of the world where U.S. interests might be threatened. Reliance on a seapower strategy might call for major U.S. investment in naval and marine forces and for emphasis on the Army's ability to provide a modest strategic reserve for lesser contingencies.

An opposing view is that power in international politics is strongly influenced by what nations perceive it to be. In Europe, increasingly fluid relations among the NATO and Warsaw Pact nations may depend in part on the perceived balance of conventional military power. From this point of view, elaborate scenarios about Soviet attack and NATO defense in central Europe provide a convenient means of measuring what the local military balance is. Should the calculations point to an obvious and persistent wartime advantage to one side or the other, peacetime political influence could follow.

In the past, U.S. technological and nuclear superiority was generally accepted as an effective counterweight to Soviet superiority in forces and military manpower. But recently Soviet investment in modern technology for its general purpose forces may be undermining that assessment, raising the possibility of a perceived military imbalance in Europe. If the Soviet Union is perceived to have equipment as good as or better than that of the United States, its traditional superiority in numbers may take on new military significance.

From this point of view, recent changes in the Army's combat power and readiness for battle in Europe are a matter of renewed interest. If there is or soon will be a Soviet military advantage which could be decisive in a conventional ground war in Europe, the United States would probably choose to correct the imbalance, regardless of how unlikely the possibility of such a war seemed to be. Further, if detailed calculations about what would happen in a highly unlikely war contribute to perceptions about military power in Europe, and, if such perceptions constitute an important source of political influence, then the Army's warfighting capability in Europe is important for peacetime foreign policy reasons as well.

These two views are complementary if the Army maintains the mix and level of forces for both. At present, the 16-division force structure, which comprises in the provision of forces for both strategies, may or may not be large enough for both (a question beyond the scope of this paper). But in any case the force may be insufficiently supported, particularly for NATO reinforcement. This point can be made most clearly by examining alternative force structures in detail; exploring how each might contribute to either a NATO or worldwide strategic reserve strategy, or both; and looking at the costs involved. In what follows, Army doctrine for the use of its forces in combat is briefly discussed; the impact of technology on procurement of weapons is analyzed; the Army's transition from 13 to 16 divisions is explored in detail; and alternative force structures are presented.

THE ARMY'S ORGANIZATION FOR COMBAT

Army units are structured hierarchically, with large units made up of two or more smaller units—each of which is in turn is

made up of two or more even smaller units. Standard formations are shown in Table 2.

TABLE 2.—Standard Army combat formations

HEADQUARTERS, SUBORDINATE UNITS, AND MANPOWER STRENGTH

Theater Command: Two or more corps, plus supporting units, 250,000+.

Corps: Two or more divisions, plus other combat and support units, 50,000–100,000.

Division: Three brigades, plus other combat and support units, 16,000.

Brigade*: Two or more maneuver battalions, plus supporting artillery and other combat units, 3,000–6,000.

Maneuver Battalion: Four or five tank, infantry or mechanized infantry companies, 850–1,000.

Company: Three or four platoons, each made up of infantry squads, tank crews or weapons teams, 140–240.

*Reinforced brigades and armored cavalry regiments (roughly equivalent), often operate independently of divisions, under the direct command of corps headquarters.

Typically, the senior army command in a war theater directly controls two or more corps headquarters, each of which controls two or more divisions. The allocation of divisions among corps is deliberately varied, and depends on missions, the array of opposing forces, and the terrain over which the corps must fight.

Divisions, however, are relatively standard in basic organization, consisting of a division headquarters, three subordinate brigades (among which are allocated the division's 8 to 12 maneuver battalions), a division base of combat support units (engineers, artillery, communications, etc.) and logistical support units (supply, maintenance, medical evacuation, etc.). The Army division is an integrated combat formation, combining infantry, tanks, artillery, air defense and aircraft. The Army views its divisions as the principal organizational building blocks for the conduct of combat operations.

At present, the Army has five kinds of divisions, each consisting of about 16,000 men and organized basically in the same way, but with different kinds of subordinate maneuver battalions, and therefore different capabilities. The differences in divisions are summarized in Table 3. Just as a theater commander adjusts the assignments of divisions to his corps commanders as their missions change, a division commander also typically shifts maneuver battalions among his brigades, depending on their current mission assignments. Thus, a brigade conducting the division's main attack, for example, might have assigned to it five maneuver battalions, while another brigade given a secondary role would be assigned only two battalions.

While the allocation of resources among units engaged in battle is flexible and changes with circumstances, the basic design of the Army's combat force as a whole is largely fixed and is based on detailed formulas for the number and kinds of units required to support divisions in combat. These formulas are based on past experience, modified in light of new technology, doctrine, and specific requirements generated by contingency plans as such as those prepared for NATO defense. Although the formulas themselves are manipulated by computer models, the general dimensions of combat zone force design can be summarized in a simple concept called the division force equivalent (DFE). The DFE can be defined as the average number of troops required to man a typical Army division and its supporting units in sustained combat.²

² The weakness of this concept is that it fails to account for the variations in supporting forces which would result from tailoring them to specific situations in Europe, the Middle East, Southeast Asia, or wherever

¹ Donald H. Rumsfeld, *Report to the Congress on the FY 1977 Budget and Its Implications for the FY 1978 Authorization Request and the FY 1977–81 Defense Programs* (Jan. 27, 1976), pp. 133–134.

TABLE 3.—TYPICAL U.S. ARMY DIVISIONS

Division and maneuver battalions ¹	Armored personnel		
	Tanks ²	carriers ²	Aircraft ²
Armored: 6 tank; 5 mechanized; infantry	320	350	55
Mechanized: 4 tank; 6 mechanized infantry	220	420	55
Infantry: 1 tank; 1 mechanized infantry; 8 infantry	55	70	55
Airborne: 1 light tank; 9 airborne infantry	55		165
Airmobile: 10 airmobile infantry			420

¹ Standard maneuver battalion allocations; for specific missions, a division may be given a larger or smaller number of battalions, or a different mix.

² Approximate numbers, based on Department of the Army unit tables of organization and equipment.

Currently, the DFE is defined as shown in Table 4.

TABLE 4.—Division force equivalent COMPONENT, FORCES TYPICALLY INCLUDED, AND MANPOWER SPACES

Division Combat: All division units, including maneuver battalions, division artillery, engineer, signal, cavalry, headquarters and frontline logistical support units, 16,000.

Nondivision Combat: Corps-directed assets, including additional artillery, engineer, cavalry, aviation, air defense units, and separate infantry and armored brigades 12,000.

Tactical Support: Supply, maintenance, medical transportation and administrative units which provide support to combat units, 20,000.

Total Division Force Equivalent: 48,000.

For example, if the Army committed ten active and ten reserve component divisions to battle, it would need 320,000 division combat troops, 240,000 nondivision combat troops, and 400,000 tactical support troops, for a total field force of 960,000. The remainder of the Army's military manpower would belong to the base structure (located mainly in the United States), which supports training, recruitment, research and development, and procurement. Later in this paper, the DFE is used to measure the balance of alternative force structures.

The Army designs its combat force in terms of both active and reserve component units, and typically assigns to reserve component units a large share of nondivision combat and tactical support requirements. The assumption is that enough support units to sustain the first divisions in combat are on hand, and large-scale deployment of Army forces in a war overseas would probably involve mobilization of reserves in any case.

Reliance on reserves has important budgetary consequences. Reserve units and personnel cost less to maintain in the force structure than active units and personnel, and one way to moderate Army budget growth is to shift more of its force structure into the reserves. However, reserve units typically require more time to prepare for overseas deployment than active units, and therefore the effect of shifting units into the reserves is a delay in their availability for combat.

If active forces are sufficient for the most important contingencies, then reliance on reserves is unimportant one way or the other. However, in central Europe, the magnitude of Soviet investment in its ground forces and the Soviet doctrinal emphasis on speed and violence in armored attack, increase the significance of initial efforts to defend Europe. Since no NATO country (including the United States) is willing to maintain

U.S. forces might have to fight. But for planning purposes generally, the concept is considered valid.

active forces in defensive positions sufficient to guarantee successful defense, the role of active and reserve component forces in strategic reserve becomes more significant.

CHEMICAL WEAPONS ARMS CONTROL

HON. RICHARD T. SCHULZE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. SCHULZE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I submitted for the RECORD a resolution on the question of chemical weapons arms control. Inadvertently, however, the text of the resolution was omitted from the RECORD. I would now like to submit that resolution which would encourage the rapid conclusion of an international treaty banning chemical weapons:

HOUSE RESOLUTION 268

Whereas the policy of the United States is not to make first use of lethal and incapacitating chemical weapons in war; and

Whereas in 1972 the United States signed the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction, which declared that, "each State Party to the Convention affirms the recognized objective of effective prohibition of chemical weapons and, to this end, undertakes to continue negotiations in good faith with a view to reaching agreement on effective measures for the prohibition of their development, production, and stockpiling and for their destruction"; and

Whereas in 1975 the United States ratified the Geneva Protocol prohibiting the use of chemical and biological weapons in warfare; and

Whereas the United States supports the continuing negotiations being conducted by the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament toward this end of an effective chemical weapons treaty: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, that it is the sense of the House of Representatives to—

(1) urge the President to issue a statement of policy declaring a moratorium on the further United States manufacture of lethal and incapacitating nerve and mustard agents and the so-called binary agents, for a period of three years; and

(2) request that the President, as a sign of good faith to all the world, order the destruction of some 3,000 tons of lethal chemical mustard agent from existing United States stockpiles over the same period of three years; and, invite interested international organizations, such as a delegation from the CCD, to view the destruction process; and

(3) issue an open invitation to the Soviet Union and other nations which possess quantities of lethal chemical weapons to indicate their sincerity in seeking a chemical weapons treaty by following the example of the United States; and challenges the third-world nations to refrain from seeking the introduction of chemical weapons into their arsenals; and

(4) urge the participants of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament to rapidly conclude an international treaty banning the manufacture and possession of lethal chemical weapons. This treaty, in order to be meaningful, should provide for the destruction of existing stocks and production facilities in a phased manner over a specified period of time. The treaty must also pro-

vide a process of verification of the disposal of stocks and facilities through independent, international procedures. And, the treaty must establish an international mechanism for investigating suspicious activities, including provisions for challenge and on-site inspections.

OUR CHANGING CLIMATE

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for February 9, 1977, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

OUR CHANGING CLIMATE

The winter of 1976-1977 is the coldest since the United States began keeping weather statistics. It is the winter of all-time low temperatures, a genuine crisis in the natural gas industry, massive lay-offs of workers from plants shut down by fuel shortages, the closing of thousands of schools, and a plea from a new President to turn down thermostats to 65 degrees. It is also the winter that froze the Ohio and Mississippi rivers from bank to bank for long stretches and the winter that has hurt the economy and brought suffering and tragedy to many Americans. To make matters worse, the forecast is for more of the same.

The meteorologists agree that the immediate reason for the bitterly cold winter is the high level westerly winds in the upper atmosphere which are cutting across the Rockies much farther north than usual and dipping farther south than normal. Pacific storms have picked up the winds, resulting in heavy snowfalls from the Rockies eastward.

Whether the big freeze of this year is related to long-range trends is uncertain. Scientists are not sure whether the earth is actually trending towards a new ice age or is getting warmer. A considerable body of scientific data can be induced to support either trend and only time and more research will tell which is correct. Scientists do agree that the earth is entering a period of increased variability, with weather patterns fluctuating more dramatically than in recent decades. Changes in these patterns could wreak havoc in food production, which is intimately linked with fluctuations in weather and climate. Intensive research is going on to understand the weather patterns better. Some scientists allege that excessive white particulate matter from pollution may be cooling the atmosphere by reflecting the sun's radiation away from the earth. Other scientists contend carbon dioxide, which is released when fossil fuel is burned, keeps the heat radiation produced by earth from escaping to outer space, thereby warming the atmosphere.

All of these climactic developments have not escaped the notice of the Congress. Last year the first steps were taken toward a program of weather modification with the passage of the National Weather Modification Policy Act. This legislation provides for a year-long study of the practice of weather modification in order to get a firmer grip on its possible benefits and misuses. The program is designed to develop a national weather modification policy and program, and to determine how weather modification can decrease the adverse impact on agriculture and economic growth. The objective of the legislation is to develop a framework

within which we can use our technological capabilities to modify weather without hurting each other. Other bills have been introduced in the Congress to establish a climatic warning system and to develop a global monitoring system for climate.

Almost every federal department is involved in some type of weather related activity: the Department of Defense needs specialized weather services in support of military operations, the Department of Transportation's Federal Aviation Administration uses weather information in operating its air traffic control system and other meteorological programs are conducted by the Departments of Commerce, Agriculture, Interior and State. This year federal expenditures for weather operations and both applied and basic research will exceed \$782 million.

The first half of the 20th century was the best period for food production in the last 1000 years—but our luck with the weather could change. If it does, there are a number of approaches which can be taken to reduce the effects of adverse weather on food production. Primarily, we must proceed with research to obtain more accurate climate forecasts. With more intensive research we may be able to project rainfall, temperatures and droughts a season in advance, allowing the experts to suggest planting patterns to maximize yields. On the theory that a prudent policy plans for difficulties, we can use water more efficiently, control wind and water erosion, develop irrigation systems, develop tougher crop varieties, improve plant species and crop and livestock management techniques, and provide information to farmers on climate and how they can reduce the impact of bad weather. We can also continue to explore weather modification techniques and how they can affect specific agricultural practices.

Even small attempts at weather modification can have overwhelming results, both positive and negative. Weather experts have warned that weather modification techniques can cause floods, tidal waves and drought, and could be engaged in secretly, often without the awareness of the affected population. A recent CIA report has outlined possible economic and political upheavals almost beyond comprehension because of changes in the earth's climate.

Positive benefits on food production could also result from small climate alterations, and prospects are good for increased improvement in our ability to modify the weather by increasing rainfall at critical times, decreasing hurricane winds, and reducing damage caused by wind and hail. These improved techniques may be widely utilized during the next five to ten years provided a major research effort is supported and encouraged.

WELCOME ABOARD FOR NEW NAVY SECRETARY

HON. JAMES G. MARTIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, as a new administration settles in and as we on the Hill seek to assess its personnel, we are fortunate to get some help in that process from constituents. I would like to share with you and our colleagues the recollections of my close friend, William K. Van Allen of Charlotte, N.C., about his friend, W. Graham Claytor, our new

Secretary of the Navy. I would add to his comments my own observation that Mr. Claytor's leadership at Southern Railway resulted in it making Dun's Review's list of the five best managed companies. In a world where it just will not do to have only one of the world's five best navies, he can count on a lot of support for insuring that ours always is No. 1.

NAVY HEAD'S NAVIGATION GOOD,
CHARLOTTEAN SAYS

Under a sunless autumn sky in 1941, the Navy submarine chaser USS *Opal* steamed north out of Miami carrying sailor William K. Van Allen, now a Charlotte lawyer.

"We go out of Miami, and it's rough outside," Van Allen of 132 Cherokee Rd., recalled Friday. High seas slapped the ship so hard, he said, they knocked its old compass out of commission.

A young navigator rounded up a radio, Van Allen recalled, and tuned in stations in West Palm Beach, Jacksonville and Savannah. Calculating the *Opal's* position from the strength of the signals, the navigator guided the ship for 60 miles, finally declaring: "I believe Charleston light should be dead ahead."

"It was," Van Allen said. "He did it all with a portable radio."

The *Opal's* navigator on that blind voyage was W. Graham Claytor Jr., an ensign from Roanoke, Va. Wednesday, Claytor, 64, was picked by President Carter to guide the Navy again, this time as secretary of the Navy.

"I think he'll make an outstanding secretary," Van Allen, 62, said of Claytor, chief executive officer of Southern Railway Co. since 1967. "I don't think President Carter could have made a better choice."

He should know. He and Claytor have been close friends since 1939, when the two shared a house in Washington as they embarked on legal careers.

For a while, it looked as if the two careers were stamped from the same mold. Van Allen and Claytor were at Harvard Law School together (although they didn't know each other then), they entered the Navy together. Each commanded submarine chasers and destroyer escorts, and each returned to law practice in Washington after the war.

Van Allen left Washington in 1950 for Charlotte, and Claytor stayed, practicing law until 1967, when he became president of Southern Railway. He stepped up to chairman nine years later.

As Southern's head, Van Allen said, Claytor oversaw major investment by the railroad in downtown Charlotte and Atlanta. The North Carolina National Bank computer center was built on Southern land at 2nd and College streets.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AMENDMENTS

HON. CARL D. PERKINS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing, with the cosponsorship of Congressman AL QUIE, a bill to make various technical and miscellaneous amendment to those portions of the Education Amendments of 1976 which affect federally supported vocational education programs.

We have drafted this bill because various relatively minor problems have been

brought to our attention during the course of the last few months as the Office of Education has tried to implement the new amendments. This bill will assure that the Office of Education drafts the regulations in true conformity with the law.

The only important area which these amendments affect is that involving State and local administration of vocational education programs. The new law, which is to take effect October 1, 1977, provides that not more than \$25 million may be appropriated under the act for the support of State administration and that no funds under the act may be used for the support of local administration.

The bill we are introducing today places State administration in the block grant and therefore would permit more than \$25 million to be used for that purpose. The bill does not deal with the question of local administration.

The Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education has scheduled a hearing on February 17 to receive testimony on this bill; and at that hearing we will focus on various alternatives to find the best manner to provide some Federal assistance for local administration. Congressman QUIE and I do want to make clear, however, that we support the use of some Federal money for local administration; but we are not ready today to endorse any particular method of providing that assistance.

The reason for our present reluctance is that we have found from data submitted to us by the American Vocational Association that the use of Federal funds for local administration varies very greatly among the States. Some States such as my own State of Kentucky use no Federal funds for this purpose while other States such as my neighboring State of Ohio use 18 percent of their Federal funds for this purpose. I believe we must receive expert testimony on this question before we can fashion the best alternative.

I welcome the testimony of any Members who may wish to testify that day. We have already scheduled testimony from the American Vocational Association.

ONE HUNDRED AND TWELFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF THE AMERICAN SOKOL ORGANIZATION

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, the first American Sokol unit was founded on Feb. 15, 1865, by a group of Czech immigrants in St. Louis, Mo. In my own city of Chicago on Oct. 30, 1892, the first Slovak Sokol Society was formed.

The members of the American Sokol Organization—Czech—and Sokol USA—Slovak—as well as the Catholic Sokols, practice a system of physical fitness through a series of calisthenics and activities which are all encompassing, with

the realization that to maintain a free nation, its people must be physically and morally strong.

Sokol, which is a Czechoslovak word meaning falcon, symbolizes well the ideals of the Sokol organizations, because the falcon is a bird that has a love of freedom as well as strength, courage, and agility. The Sokol organization was founded in Czechoslovakia in 1862 by Dr. Miroslav Tyrš (1832-84), a professor of history and esthetics at Charles University in Prague, and by Jindřich Fügner (1822-65), who was a businessman and a lover of the arts and music. These two men perfected a system of physical fitness through a series of calisthenics and other activities, based on the idea that each individual was important and could and should progress to the ultimate peak of physical fitness. Their motto was "A sound mind in a healthy body."

Sokol is a fraternal body whose members vary in age from small children to senior citizens, and the organization strives for the development of physical, spiritual, moral, and cultural enlightenment. The physical education program stresses individual initiative, creativity, as well as self-discipline, which is a basic requirement for personal achievement enabling the gymnast to become a cohesive and cooperative member of American society. In uniting Czechoslovak culture, the American heritage, and Sokol ideals, the organization contributes greatly to the welfare, safety, and freedom of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join with Sokol members in the 11th Congressional District of Illinois, which I am honored to represent, in the city of Chicago, and all over our Nation as they celebrate this anniversary.

A TRIBUTE TO THE VIGILANT FIREFIGHTERS

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, it is not often that we have the privilege of honoring the many individuals who ably and unselfishly serve and protect our communities. Therefore, it was with great pleasure that I attended the 72d annual dinner and dance of the Vigilant Engine & Hook & Ladder Co. of Great Neck, N.Y., where I joined with many others in paying tribute to the valiant firemen of that community.

Among those being toasted were several individuals who have distinguished themselves in their service to Great Neck and their fellow-firefighters. I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the names of these men so that they may receive the recognition which they so richly deserve: In appreciation for ambulance service—Richard Boorstein, John Lyons, Bryan Weisman, and Glenn Zagoren; fireman of the year, awarded for active devotion to duty beyond the

normal requirements—James B. Dunn; tenure awards: 20 years of active service—Michael Okon; 30 years of active service—Jules Santagata; 40 years of active service—Robert Lincoln, Sr.

The work of a firefighter often places him in danger as he serves his community, and I believe it is appropriate at this time to offer a prayer for firemen, that they may ever be watched over:

O God, in Thy bountiful mercy, bestow Thy provident blessing upon all valiant Self-Sacrificing Firemen in the performance of their duty.

Grant O Lord, we beseech Thee, the grace of Thy constant protection to those who are exposed to great peril in their constant efforts to safeguard persons and properties from the ravages of fire.

As Thou, Dear Lord, didst deliver of old the three young men from the fiery furnace, so guide these men through their trials of life that they may be delivered both from bodily injury and from all dangers to eternal salvation, through Christ Our Lord. Amen.

In addition, I would like to mention the names of the officers who were kind enough to invite me to this gathering and provide me with the opportunity to honor the Vigilant Engine & Hook & Ladder Co.: Ralph Fliedner, Jr., president of the company, Chief Frank Gilliar, Jr., 1st Asst. Chief Robert Lincoln, Jr., 2d Asst. Chief Edward Canfield, Capt. Leo Flook and Lee Ielpi, 1st Lt. Dennis Hill, and 2d Lt. Richard Boorstein.

COMBAT VIOLENT CRIME

HON. WILLIS D. GRADISON, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Speaker, the latest crime statistics released by the Federal Bureau of Investigation include some alarming figures. The number of violent crimes is increasing, as is the number of career criminals, who have been arrested two or more times.

From 1970 to 1975, violent crime increased by 39 percent, and the murder rate alone increased by 28 percent. Of these crimes, a frightening 25 percent of aggravated assaults were committed with a firearm in 1975. Worse, a gun was used in nearly 66 percent of all murders in the same year.

Career criminals committed 64 percent of the violent crimes between 1970 and 1975. These criminals trade on the public's fear, and it is time for the Federal Government to aid the public by cracking down on criminals. For this reason, I introduced H.R. 909, which requires stiff, additional prison sentences for anyone committing a felony involving the use of a gun.

Under this bill, anyone who commits a felony with a firearm would receive a mandatory sentence of 5 to 10 years for a first offense. Although this mandatory sentence can be lessened by a judge for a first offense, he must state in writing why the additional sentence was not imposed. For a second conviction, the additional penalty would range from 10 to 30 years. The mandatory sentence for

second convictions could not be lessened by the judge.

H.R. 909 does not restrict the rights of law-abiding citizens, such as sportsmen, in their legitimate use of a firearm. Instead, it is designed to protect the American public by putting the criminal on notice that he will be severely punished for the unlawful use of a gun.

We all agree that something must be done to curb the criminal use of firearms. A stiff, mandatory sentence for a person committing a felony with a firearm is an effective weapon against crime, and it is aimed at criminals, not law-abiding citizens. I urge all Members of the House to support this legislation.

A NEW LOOK AT THE INAUGURATION

HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, I am especially proud of one of my constituents, Lloyd B. Ostrander, of Chula Vista, Calif. Among other distinctions, Mr. Ostrander holds the Medal of Freedom for his part in teaching literally hundreds of thousands of young American GI's to swim during World War II.

A native of Minnesota, he feels a special kinship with our new Vice President, and so it was most appropriate that he and his wife, Mildred, were able to come to Washington for Inaugural Week and take part in many of the events that surrounded the swearing-in of President Carter and WALTER MONDALE.

On his return home, Mr. Ostrander composed a short report on his experiences at the inauguration. It is a fresh look at a major national experience, and I am pleased to include a portion of Mr. Ostrander's statement at this point as an extension of my own remarks:

STATEMENT OF LLOYD B. OSTRANDER

Perhaps the most memorable incident occurred while we were waiting with other friends of the Mondales. The famous Marine Corps Band had been assembled in the reception hall, and when Fritz and Joan Mondale arrived to receive us, the band burst into the Minnesota football rouser. That stirring music recalled the years of successive stadium victories back in Minnesota during Mondale's school days at the University of Minnesota—a winning streak that Fritz himself is still riding.

Another dramatic moment came when the Carters arrived at the Visitor's Center Section of the Inaugural Ball, where an estimated 10,000 couples were struggling for dancing space on three floors, each larger than a football playing field.

We had inadvertently found sitting room with about five formally dressed, yet fun-loving young couples who told us they had crossed the Delaware with a few pints of high quality Scotch unavailable elsewhere. When the Carters arrived, these belles made Mrs. Ostrander the guardian of their bulging purses, mink capes and ermine stoles. They asked me to guard their Scotch, while moving toward the Presidential couple. But I also took flight, hoping in vain to dance with Rosalynn Carter!

When the Carters had departed, and things

began to quiet down, our fellow merry-makers returned for their fur coats and purses. To lighten their load, we finished the Scotch with them.

They invited us to another after-the-Ball party. But, having previous commitments with our California friends bivouacked with us at our hotel just across the Potomac, we reluctantly declined and headed for our two a.m. breakfast date. It was a fitting end to a wideawake night.

The confidence and trust that Carter-Mondale supporters have in each other is indicative of what we can expect in our new government.

WHAT ENERGY PROBLEM?

HON. ROBERT E. BAUMAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, there is only one point on which everyone concerned about our Federal energy policy is agreed, and that is that there is no comprehensive policy. No one seriously believes that turning down our thermostats to just above freezing and shutting down our schools and offices will be enough of a solution, much less a proper one.

Louis Rukeyser, columnist as well as accomplished economist, explains what a genuine energy policy must entail in an article which appeared in the Baltimore Evening Sun of February 7. As he notes, we are not only faced with our short-term problems of fuel shortages and increasing gasoline prices. We are also faced with grave energy problems which pose risks to the survival of our communities and the Nation itself, in the not too distant future, yet they are problems which must be solved now. Mr. Rukeyser's views call attention to choices facing this Congress in the next 12 months, and they deserve reflection and demand resolution:

TIME TO LOOK AT COLD FACTS ABOUT OUR ENERGY POLICIES

(By Louis Rukeyser)

The theme song of the American people apparently is supposed to be, "Baby, It's Cold Inside." Instead of the Eisenhower jacket or the Jacqueline Kennedy pillbox hat, this era seems destined to be remembered for the Carter long johns. Patriotism is to be measured not by raising the flag but by lowering the thermostat.

Well, pardon me if I enter one small, mild dissent. We are in danger of being swept away, in an orgy of uncomfortable—but smug—self-denial, into thinking that just because we're suffering we are finally coming to grips with our chilly problem. Sorry, but that kind of comfort is cold, too.

What we are being asked to do, in essence, is to deal with what is, by far, the less important part of the energy equation. Conservation is splendid, and in many areas overdue. It has the additional economic benefit of saving money—a point that surely has not escaped the many hotels, restaurants and other business establishments that keep urging us to cooperate while on their premises.

We have, indeed, been wasteful, and we must, indeed, conserve. It did not take the current cruel winter to validate the necessity for restraining U.S. energy consumption.

But let us try to see the picture whole. Conservation alone will never move us toward three essential energy goals: keeping our families warm in winter, avoiding blackmail in foreign affairs and providing the jobs for those who need them. All those goals, in the end, require action on the supply side.

Yet despite all the jokes about Mrs. Carter's tears, and the self-righteous scanning of one another's thermostats, we continue to ignore this more vital part of the answer to the crisis. No leader in either party has had the courage to say plainly that we are going to have to compromise some of the dreams for ecological perfection now—that we are going to have to get moving on new energy production, and that this is indisputably going to have to mean some compromises on the environmental side.

For starters, we are going to have to expedite the flow of oil from Alaska. We're going to have to proceed with the safe development of nuclear power—an area where the U.S. pioneered in war, but has lagged behind many of its competitors in peace. We're going to have to encourage the development of more desirable alternative sources for the future, such as solar power. Most urgently and most immediately, we are going to have to start making far better use of this nation's huge—and internationally unique—reservoirs of coal.

We're not out of energy, but we do seem to be awfully short on guts. What we need is not more sweaters but more sense. We certainly don't need a massive new government spending program—but we do need, openly and honestly, to assign a premier national priority to increasing our own energy resources. We have gabbed about this for the three and a half years since the Arabs stuck their finger in our eye, but we have disgracefully failed to do it.

Just as we have to have the courage to recognize the necessity for environmental compromise—in all our interests, including those of future generations—so we have to stop talking political malarkey and start talking economic sense on such issues as finally removing the controls on natural gas prices, and allowing the market-price system (which is, quite simply, the best tool we have) to get us the energy and other resources that an expanding economy will need.

We're in a jam now, and it is to a distasteful extent our own fault. Instead of moving to encourage energy production, we have twice since the embargo penalized the energy industry with new taxation. Instead of moving boldly to develop our own resources, we have temporized with every pressure group on the political scene. Now we're freezing, and worried, and we're going to have to lower our thermostats, but the real tragedy would be if we once again failed to look at the cold facts behind our self-induced crisis.

FUTURE HOMEMAKERS OF AMERICA WEEK

HON. DAVID W. EVANS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. EVANS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that many people throughout our country will be observing Future Homemakers of America Week during February 6-12.

Future Homemakers of America is one of six vocational agencies. It is part of the junior and senior high school home economic curriculum that provides meaning and motivation for our youth to

reach out beyond the classroom environment. Rather than be structured in teaching the domestic necessities, the organization provides unique opportunities for our young people to develop citizenship and leadership qualities and helps them to deal with the role of both wage earner and homemaker.

There are 199 chapters in the State of Indiana which all work toward bettering their own lives as well as their fellow citizens. They have worked on pertinent projects such as with the National Foundation of March of Dimes to stress the importance of peer-group education of birth defects and the dangers of teenage pregnancy.

Mr. Speaker, the Future Homemakers of America has inspired our youth to assert renewed pride and self-respect through their potential. I want to share these fine qualities of this organization with my colleagues. I also want to extend my best wishes to members within my own State of Indiana and to those throughout our Nation.

ALASKAN NATURAL GAS

HON. JOHN P. MURTHA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, among many important energy decisions Congress will make this year, a vital one will decide by what route to bring Alaskan natural gas to the United States.

I support the El-Paso All-American line which will bring the gas through a pipeline parallel to the Alaskan oil line, then ship it by LNG tanker to California. I favor this plan over the idea of a trans-Canadian pipeline because I think it is better for the U.S. economy, safer environmentally, enhances U.S. energy independence, and will bring the gas to the United States sooner.

I would urge my colleagues to study the issue carefully. The decision's importance is shown by the fact that once completely finished the Alaskan gas will supply enough fuel to heat 24 million homes a month or protect 1 million jobs a month. I will insert a news release I issued last week following a decision by a Federal Power Commission law judge favoring the trans-Canadian line.

I would also ask any Member interested in the pipeline decision to contact my office for further information on the El-Paso All-American route. Also of interest are the February 2 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD comments of Senator YOUNG who was kind enough to add some of my earlier remarks on this subject to his own.

The article follows:

WASHINGTON, FEBRUARY 1.—The decision by a Federal Power Commission Administrative Law Judge on development of Alaskan natural gas reserves was sharply criticized today by U.S. Congressman John P. Murtha who said the decision would delay vital natural gas reserves for the United States.

"The judge's decision could delay delivery of Alaskan natural gas to the lower U.S. by a minimum of 1½ years and as much as 3

to 5 years," Murtha said. "This cold weather emphasizes the need for gas as quickly as possible."

FPC Judge Nathum Litt approved a Trans-Canadian project to build a pipeline through Alaska and Canada to the Midwest United States. Congressman Murtha favors the El-Paso proposal which would build a pipeline paralleling the Alaskan oil line and deliver gas by tanker to California ports.

"Besides the delay in the Canadian route, the Alaskan route would produce more U.S. tax revenue, more jobs for Americans, and do less environmental damage to the northern wilderness," said Murtha who is a member of the House Interior Subcommittee of Appropriations which oversees most federal energy spending.

"Very importantly, the Alaskan project is controlled totally by the U.S. and state of Alaska. The Canadian route requires approval and possible financing from Canadian national and provincial authorities.

"The Alaskan line is quicker, better for the U.S. economy, and moves us closer to energy independence. I am hopeful President Carter and Congress will reverse this decision."

Murtha said he based delay estimates on problems of winter construction in new arctic regions, required approval by the Canadian government and its provinces, and settlement of native claims disputes (already cleared in Alaska but unsettled in Canada.)

Even the quicker El-Paso route would not get any gas to the U.S. before 1982. Following final FPC approval the President and Congress must review and approve any decision.

ENERGY CONSERVATION

HON. DAVE STOCKMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Speaker, in the wake of the most devastating winter in the history of southern Michigan, where subzero temperatures have been endured for several days, where working men and women have been temporarily released from their jobs, and where voluntary energy conservation is a way of life, I must commend the board of education of the Lawton Community School District for their approval of a resolution to reduce the use of energy in the schools so that life may return to normal in this snow and ice bound region.

Superintendent Ray Bandlow has set a fine example that I trust will be followed by many public school administrators across the country. Efforts being made by this Congress are not enough to ease the shortages that exist in the Midwest and Northeastern States. Voluntary energy conservation initiated on the local level is a major step to recovery, more potent than any legislation we may adopt.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues as they return to their home districts this week, to stress the importance of voluntary energy conservation and to push for approval by all public school systems the following resolution:

Whereas the United States is engulfed in an energy crisis of great magnitude, and

Whereas millions of American workers face lay-off due to this national emergency, and

Whereas schools and industries in many neighboring States have ceased operation due to an energy shortage, and

Whereas governmental agencies at all

levels have not sufficiently addressed themselves to the energy crisis;

Therefore, be it resolved that the superintendent is directed to take steps to reduce our consumption of energy, including, but not limited to, the reduction of building temperatures, and

Therefore, be it further resolved that the local, State and Federal governments are encouraged to strive towards preventing future energy shortages by immediately taking action to encourage the development of our natural resources and the long range development of energies other than from natural gas, petroleum, and coal.

A MODEL EXAMPLE OF ENERGY CONSERVATION

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, in the first of a series of promised "fireside chats," President Carter asked for a commitment from the American people—to conserve energy. He admitted the energy shortage is not short lived, but a continuing problem that would not be solved unless we develop a national energy policy and take energy conservation seriously.

It has been over 2 years since this country experienced the long lines at the gas station. But in this instance, we cannot blame an Arab oil embargo for our problems. Experts tell us there has been a natural gas shortage since 1971—but it did not cause any crisis since many industries experiencing a service cutoff switched to other fuels and the United States has had relatively mild winters for the past several years. This winter there just was not enough gas to go around and industries depending on natural gas shut down and workers went home. The severity of the problem startled everyone when schools had to close and it was feared there was not enough gas to supply residential and other high priority users.

To deal with this immediate problem, President Carter sent to Congress an emergency natural gas bill which gives the President authority to divert natural gas to areas hardest hit by shortages. I am happy to report I voted for this bill which is now public law. But the long-range solution to alleviate shortages depends upon whether we can adopt sound conservation measures and stick to them.

It has been brought to my attention that there is a company in my 31st District of California that is voluntarily doing just that. The Northrop Corp. aircraft group in Hawthorne, Calif., has instituted a energy conservation program that has already saved the local aircraft manufacturer more than 100 million cubic feet of natural gas annually. Northrop was honored last week by the Hawthorne Chamber of Commerce and the local Kiwanis Club as part of their Energy Conservation Month where local industries and businesses are encouraged to participate in energy conservation activities. When a natural gas shortage was

not a topic of national concern in 1974, Northrop started their 10-month survey by maintenance and company technicians of all gas-burning equipment. The purpose was to determine whether any adjustments had to be made for peak operating efficiency in any of the heaters, water heaters, boilers and ovens in the plant. Northrop engineers have estimated the survey has cut down on the plant's use of gas significantly. In fact, it is estimated the gas they saved would supply approximately 12,000 Hawthorne homes with gas for a normal month.

The example set by the community of Hawthorne and the Northrop Corp. is a model for all of us. On their own initiative, they are doing exactly what the President asked and they are doing it voluntarily. Since the plant is located in southern California, they do not have to be afraid severe weather will cut off their natural gas supply, but they realized energy conservation is not a regional matter. If natural gas has to be redistributed, then we should all be trying to save so there is enough to go around. Also, I think it is significant they instituted this program long before a crisis hit us.

I wanted to bring this matter to the attention of my colleagues and urge them to adopt similar measures in their own communities. The city of Hawthorne and the Northrop Corp. are to be highly commended and congratulated for demonstrating this type of national awareness and community concern.

SISTER JOAN KISTER HONORED WITH HEART MEDAL FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF HEALTH

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, it is often the case that those who deserve the most credit seek the least recognition, and display only modesty for their achievements. This is precisely the manner in which Sister Joan Kister behaves, and it was not until I read an article in Newsday that I became aware of Sister Joan's recent accomplishments.

Sister Joan is unique in that her activities extend into a variety of areas beyond that of her commitment to the Franciscan Missionaries of Mary. When one speaks of Sister Joan, reference must also be made of her work as a construction planner and registered nurse.

Sister Joan's interest in drafting began 37 years ago, when she took an after-school course in drafting at St. Mark's High School in St. Louis, Mo. Since that time, Sister Joan has used the combination of her drafting techniques and her nursing degree to supervise and expand hospitals around the world. In 1957, she set off to perform these duties for a hospital in Pondoland, South Africa, and was so successful that she was sent to supervise the expansion of hospitals on Reunion Island in the Indian Ocean and in Petaling, Malaysia.

Sister Joan has been tireless in her ef-

forts and has continued to use her multitude of skills to benefit us all. In 1970, Sister Joan took over the coordination of a 210-bed expansion project at St. Francis Hospital in Roslyn. It was at this time that she earned her nickname, "the hard-hatted nun," for Sister Joan did not supervise from behind her drawing board, but rather, she ventured out to the construction site daily, donning the traditional workman's hard-hat. Her ingenuity in ordering an advanced building method for the project has been credited by hospital officials with saving months of work and millions of dollars. The "hard-hatted nun" and her project found their way into numerous newspapers here and abroad and after the expansion, the hospital changed its name to St. Francis Hospital and Heart Center.

Sister Joan, who holds a master's degree in health services administration, was made executive director of the hospital in 1973. On February 18, she will receive the Heart Medal for the Advancement of Health given by the hospital's board of directors. I would like to offer Sister Joan my personal congratulations for an honor richly deserved.

I consider my constituents and I to be particularly fortunate to have Sister Joan working in our district, but I believe that we can all be thankful for her unending devotion to the improvement of health facilities and her outstanding accomplishments in this field.

ALTON LOCK AND DAM 26

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, Locks and Dam No. 26 at Alton, Ill., is perhaps the most important link in our Nation's waterway transportation system. Located just below the confluence of the upper Mississippi and Illinois Rivers, the 600-foot long lock must handle twice as many barges as any other 600-foot lock in the Mississippi River system. The current facility is inadequate and continually causes delays in moving vital fuel to the upper Midwest and grain to export markets. Moreover, it is deteriorating.

The House Public Works Committee has promised speedy consideration of a bill authorizing construction of a new facility with a single 1,200-foot lock. Action this year is of the utmost importance. Congress must guarantee that there will be no interruption of commerce which would adversely affect the entire Midwest's economy. Past delays have already needlessly cost consumers millions of dollars. The new, larger lock will greatly reduce this waste of time and money.

The bill I am introducing today with Congressman PRICE authorizes immediate construction of a new dam with one 1,200-foot lock, as recommended last fall by the administration, and calls for a complete study of the Midwest's future transportation and ecological needs. I

hope Congress will act speedily on my bill.

BANKS AND UNIONS: UNEQUAL BEDFELLOWS

HON. THEODORE S. WEISS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, Sunday's New York Daily News contained an article by Victor Gotbaum, executive director of District Council 37, American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees and Edward Handman, the council's director of public relations, which I would like to share with my colleagues.

There has been much discussion regarding the role of the banks and the unions in the city's fiscal crisis. This article sets forth some of the important contributions made by the unions:

THE BANKS AND UNIONS: UNEQUAL BEDFELLOWS

(By Victor Gotbaum and Edward Handman)

For a couple of weeks now, the mayor of New York has been meeting with the banks to discuss the banks' request for "outside controls" over the city budget. The banks have been telling his honor that before they will agree to stretch out payments due them on MAC bonds they hold, they want to make certain that New York City will be run under the supervision of some kind of "outside controls." What the mayor has yet to make clear to the people of this city is exactly what kind of "outside controls" the banks propose.

First, they suggested an outside commission to "monitor and control the budgeting and financing of New York City and its covered agencies." That's all, just control over the budgets for schools, police, hospitals, fire, libraries—you name it. The last word on what New York City will or will not do for its citizens will rest in a "commission."

The mayor hasn't mentioned yet, either, how long the banks feel these "outside controls" should go on. Take a guess. But remember, think like a banker. The bankers feel a reasonable time for an outside commission to monitor and control New York City would be 20 years.

Another little zinger the banks slipped in is that in any year the city would be prohibited from increasing its budget appropriations more than 5% over the year before. If the cost of living goes up 7% one year, and chalk, oil, asphalt, hospital supplies, all go up an average of 7%, we will just have to cut back more services to meet the commission's 5% ceiling.

The banks have been asked to defer payments on the principal on MAC bonds. They'll still collect the interest, but if the city could put off paying the principal it can save \$105 million in cash this year. The banks also thought it would be nice, then, if the interest on their MAC bonds could be raised a little, or a lot.

The city asked the pension funds of the municipal unions to do the same thing, defer payments on the principal of their MAC bonds. The unions agreed and put no conditions on the money.

We hear a lot about how the unions and the banks have bailed out the city together. It hasn't been quite 50-50 between them, however. Right now, the banks hold 1.4 billion dollars in city and MAC securities. The unions hold 2.1 billion, 50% more. The unions have committed themselves to buy another 1.6 billion before June 30, 1978. The

banks have committed nothing. The banks haven't put any money in the city since September 30, 1975.

What if union leaders thought like bankers. Suppose Gotbaum, Maye and all those other heavies told the city, "You want us to defer payments? Okay, but first you have to raise the interest you're paying us now. Second, we want 20-year-controls on the city to see that we have no layoffs and no cuts in salaries, fringes or pensions for the next 20 years."

The attack on the unions would come from every paper, every station, every politician and would-be politician who ever woke up in the morning wondering how to get his name in the papers that day. But when such an idea comes from the banks, our mayor doesn't even bother to tell us about it and our media-mavens don't think it's worth discussing. Except, of course, for the paper in your hand right now. One of the surprises of the fiscal crisis is that the municipal unions and The News actually found something they could agree on: that this city can't turn its back on its banks.

Lately, the banks sound like they're ready to settle for less. But from their point of view it doesn't hurt to ask, they don't get embarrassed by asking for too much. They've learned that, to paraphrase that popular line of a few years ago, "Being rich means never having to say you're sorry."

SAVE THE "LUCKY LOU"

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss not to mention to my colleagues the growing campaign to save the U.S.S. *St. Louis* from the scrap heap.

Why save the *St. Louis*, or "Lucky Lou" as she is so affectionately known? Because this ship represents the spirit that brought together the peoples of our Nation in those dark early days of World War II. This is the spirit that President Carter referred in his first fireside chat.

For the U.S.S. *St. Louis* was the only large warship to get underway during the attack on Pearl Harbor. For Americans in that dark December it was a stirring site to see this proud ship steaming ahead, flags flying, guns blazing, while other mighty ships were crippled in their berths in the harbor. This picture proved that the U.S. Navy might be down for an 8 count, but the count of 9 and 10 would be a long time coming.

But the U.S.S. *St. Louis* did not rest, for on February 1, 1942, the *St. Louis* took part in the hit-and-run raid on the Marshall-Gilbert Islands. This was the Navy's first offensive action in World War II. To our people, the going on the offensive was a great morale builder.

The "Lucky Lou" was hit and rehit by enemy bombs and torpedoes. It always managed to stay in action.

I was on board during the Battle of Kulu Gulf on July 3, 1943, when we took torpedo hits.

Now, however, luck may be running out unless the crew rallies to save the U.S.S. *St. Louis*. In 1951, "Lucky Lou" was sold to the Brazilian Navy. In 1976, she was decommissioned and is scheduled for scrap.

"All hands" are hearing the campaign to save the "Lucky Lou," and are responding.

It is being conducted by Al Seton of Staten Island, N.Y. 10306. Al was the editor and publisher of the ship's newspaper, the Hubble Bubble.

Mr. Speaker, in order to detail the "Save Lucky Lou" campaign at greater length, I ask the following articles be placed in the RECORD. These articles and letters are from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, the Arizona Republic, and the Staten Island Advance.

The articles follow:

CRUISER ST. LOUIS, WORLD WAR II'S "LUCKY LOU," AWAITS SCRAP HEAP

(By J. J. Millner)

Luck is running out fast for the lady known as "Lucky Lou."

"Lucky Lou"—once carried on the United States Navy register as the light cruiser USS St. Louis—survived the inferno of Pearl Harbor, slugged it out with Japanese surface craft, submarines, aircraft and shore batteries and absorbed nature's worst in the shape of Aleutian gales, all with a comparatively low loss of life.

The St. Louis was decommissioned in 1946, sold to Brazil in 1951 and renamed the Almirante Tamandare.

Brazil, modernizing its navy with fast, modern frigates, has decommissioned the Tamandare. Now, the salt-encrusted 38-year-old veteran awaits the end at the hand of the shipwreckers—to be sold for scrap.

The St. Louis saw World War II combat service at Pearl Harbor, the Gilbert and Marshall Islands, the Aleutian Islands, the Solomons, the Marianas, Leyte and Okinawa. It was credited with sinking seven Japanese warships and it earned 11 battle stars.

It was christened April 15, 1938, by Miss Nancy Lee Morrill of Ladue, the 1937 Veiled Prophet Queen.

Mindful of the traditions that bad luck haunts a ship unless the bottle of champagne is broken on the first swing, Miss Morrill swung with gusto—and success. (Miss Morrill now Mrs. Robert Brookings Smith, still lives in Ladue.)

"Lucky Lou" was the fourth American ship and the last combat vessel to bear the name St. Louis. Another USS St. Louis, an amphibious cargo ship, was launched in 1969.

On that Sunday morning of Dec. 7, 1941, the "Lucky Lou" was berthed at a pier near Battleship Row, the prime target of the Japanese.

The vessel had docked at Pearl Harbor on Nov. 28 to be fitted with radar. Two of the ship's eight boilers were out of service, as were most of its eight five-inch guns of the secondary battery. Fifteen six-inch guns made up the 10,000-ton cruiser's main battery.

The St. Louis escaped undamaged in the hail of bombs and torpedoes that capsized the battleship Oklahoma and blew up the Arizona.

Crewmen hastily fired the two boilers and manned the five-inchers, and the ship began shooting back. The St. Louis was credited with downing three aircraft.

Under the command of Capt. George A. Rood, the St. Louis backed away from its berth at 9:31 a.m., a little more than an hour and a half after the attack began. It headed down the narrow channel for the open sea at 20 knots—well above the normal speed of eight knots.

Good luck for "Lucky Lou" began at the channel's exit. A Japanese midget submarine fired two torpedoes, but both went astray.

Then followed the grim days in which the St. Louis earned its 11 combat stars.

On Feb. 1, 1942, the St. Louis participated

in the Navy's first attack operation in the war—a raid on Japanese bases in the Gilbert and Marshall Islands.

Then, in an abrupt change of climate, the St. Louis steamed to the Aleutians in the North Pacific and bombarded the island of Kiska.

The vessel's luck held against natural disasters. Off Kodiak, a gale parted a link in one of its two anchor chains. Had the other chain parted, the vessel would have been blown ashore.

Returning to the South Pacific, the St. Louis joined the group of outnumbered, outgunned and outweighed American ships in the "Slot" between Bougainville and the Guadalcanal Islands in daily battles with the Imperial Japanese Navy's "Tokyo Express."

The cruiser maintained its reputation of "Lucky Lou" when bombarding the island of Kolombangara from Kula Gulf. The ship was hit in its bow by a torpedo, which caused extensive damage, but no loss of life.

The St. Louis returned to the Mare Island, Calif., Navy Yard for repairs. Here, the ship finally unloaded articles not needed for combat, including a 25-piece silver set donated by the people of St. Louis. Unfortunately, the service has not been seen by authorities since.

In the Green Islands north of Bougainville, the ship's luck finally ran out, when a Japanese bomb killed 23 men.

The St. Louis participated in 1944 in landings in the Marianas and on Leyte in the Philippines. In the Gulf of Leyte, the St. Louis first encountered the Japanese kamikaze, or suicide pilots.

The ship was refueling on Nov. 27, 1944, when it was attacked by 10 planes, five of them kamikazes. In a 40-minute engagement the St. Louis's gunners downed six planes. But it lost 15 men and suffered serious damage.

On April 1, 1945, the St. Louis poured 1450 rounds onto Okinawa. This was part of the record salvos of 26,265 five and six-inch rounds fired in the Ryukyus campaign.

What now for "Lucky Lou"?

A. I. Seton of Staten Island, N.Y., is attempting to set up a USS St. Louis Association. He suggests that if the vessel cannot be spared from the welder's torch, at least its main mast can be brought to St. Louis.

And he's even thinking of having the ship towed up the Mississippi to St. Louis—despite its 23-foot draft and the river's nine-foot channel. Seton thinks it could be accomplished by stripping the vessel of guns and other equipment and bringing it upriver in the spring, when the Mississippi is often swollen.

Those interested in Seton's effort can reach him at 220 Otis Avenue, Staten Island, N.Y. 10306.

[From the Arizona Republic, Nov. 4, 1976]

BRAZIL NAVY SCRAPPING LUCKY U.S.S. "ST. LOUIS"

RIO DE JANEIRO.—The U.S.S. St. Louis, the first ship to escape from Pearl Harbor under her own power in the Japanese attack in 1941, has come to rest in her last harbor near Rio de Janeiro.

The lean gray cruiser, which became known as the "Lucky Lou" because of a series of dramatic escapes during World War II, has been decommissioned from the Brazilian navy, which bought her 25 years ago. She is anchored in Guanabara Bay awaiting sale for scrap.

The ship, which once carried crews of up to 1,000 men, is almost deserted. Twenty-three Brazilian seamen are removing her guns, equipment and valuable metal before the Brazilian navy auctions off the hulk.

The St. Louis, the only ship to reach the open sea during the Pearl Harbor attack, was sold to Brazil in 1951 and given one of the most honored names the Brazilians could bestow—that of Joaquin Marques Lisboa, the

marquis of Tamandare, father of the Brazilian navy.

"The Tamandare was our second largest ship for many years," said Capt. Mario Ramiro da Silva, who is supervising the stripping operations. "Only the Minas Gerais, an aircraft carrier purchased from Britain, is larger."

Da Silva recalled that the good fortune that saved the Lucky Lou from Japanese bombs also saved her from hostile fire in a Brazilian coup.

The incident took place Nov. 11, 1955, and was the only time in the ship's 25 years of Brazilian service that it saw military action. Carlos Coimbra da Luz, then interim president of Brazil, got into a dispute with his war minister, Gen. Henrique Teixeira Lott.

Lott and the Brazilian army took control of Rio de Janeiro. Lutz and his followers, including Carlos Lacerda, Brazilian editor and politician, fled aboard the Tamandare in an unsuccessful attempt to stay in power by sailing to the Port of Santos and then establishing the government in Sao Paulo.

The Tamandare had been under repair and only two of her eight boilers were functioning. The ship's progress during the escape was much slower than usual, making it an apparently easy target as she steamed past Ft. Copacabana on the point between the fashionable Rio districts of Copacabana and Ipanema.

Capt. Silvio Heck wrote in the ship's log. "Fort Copacabana opened string fire against the Tamandare and the situation became critical . . . Using the great volume of fire I had at my disposal we probably could have silenced the fort in a few minutes but it would have been very dangerous to the densely inhabited Copacabana area."

The captain held his fire and the Lucky Lou escaped despite 22 minutes of cannon fire from the fort at surprisingly close range.

Fourteen years earlier, the St. Louis had put into Pearl Harbor for installation of radar equipment. This time, six of her eight boilers were operating, although most of the eight five-inch second battery guns were not. The ship had 15 six-inch guns in her main battery.

On Sunday, Dec. 7, 1941, Japanese planes attacked the harbor, blowing up the battleship Arizona and rolling the Oklahoma over on her side. The St. Louis, under the command of Capt. George A. Rood, was undamaged. She was credited with shooting down three Japanese planes.

An hour and a half after the attack began, the St. Louis headed for open sea—this time at 20 knots, well above the normal 8-knot speed. Lou's luck continued as a Japanese submarine fired two torpedoes at the ship and missed.

The 10,000-ton cruiser was awarded 11 combat stars for service in World War II. The ship fought in the first Navy attack on Japanese forces in the Gilbert and Marshall Islands. She participated in daily actions against the Japanese navy's "Tokyo Express" between Bougainville and the Guadalcanal Islands.

She was hit once by a torpedo when bombarding the island of Kolombangara from Kula Gulf. The torpedo heavily damaged the ship's bow, but not one of the Lucky Lou's crew was killed. The St. Louis also fought in landings in the Marianas and Leyte and was used for troop transport as the war ended.

The St. Louis was launched in Newport News, Va., in April, 1938. Nancy Lee Morrill, a debutante from the St. Louis suburb of Ladue, christened the ship.

The ship's first commanding officer was Capt. Charles H. Morrison, a native of Norfolk, Va., where the cruiser was commissioned in May 1939. The cruiser's last skipper in the Brazilian navy was Capt. Hugo Stoffel.

Da Silva said the ship was decommissioned because Brazil is modernizing its naval forces. The process of removing all valuable metal

and equipment began in June and may take another six months, da Silva said.

[From the Staten Island Advance]

RECESS WITH REYCRRAFT

A campaign to save the USS St. Louis, the light cruiser which was the only major warship to get underway and gain the open sea during the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor Dec. 7, 1941, is under way by Al (New Dorp) Seton, who served aboard the ship as an enlisted man and then an officer for two and a half years. He has gained the support of four retired admirals who were also officers on the St. Louis, which was sold to the Brazilian navy in 1951 and decommissioned by that country this year. The plan is to establish a fund to "Save Lucky Lou" from the scrap heap and return it to this country, as a monument to its service. Right now it's anchored near Rio de Janeiro. Within an hour after the Japanese attack, Al says, the cruiser downed three enemy planes and scored a hit on a miniature submarine.

BACKS CAMPAIGN TO SAVE CRUISER

How delighted I was to read in Jack Reycraft's Column recently of the plan Al Seton of New Dorp has put into motion for a campaign to save the United States cruiser St. Louis from "the scrap heap!"

My brother, Frank Ambler, was another Staten Islander aboard the USS St. Louis when the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor, Dec. 7, 1941. She was the only warship to break through "The Holocaust"—heading out to the open sea in search of the enemy ("a one-ship task force").

After serving aboard the USS St. Louis three years, my brother was assigned shore duty on the West Coast. One day while reading the local newspaper he was startled to see pictures of his ship. The caption above the article read, "The Unsinkable Lucky Lou." "The Lucky Lou" had been damaged three times during the Pacific War. (This picture was taken the moment she was hit by a Japanese suicide bomber. She survived all attacks and is still there punching!" Enclosing the news account, he sent home the following letter:

"As I read and saw the pictures of my Old Girl" a chill went up my spine, and I was filled with mixed emotions: Pride for I had served aboard The Lucky Lou during some of her most troublesome times. (She won 11 battle stars, numerous unit citations, is additionally credited with having sunk seven enemy warships.

"The St. Louis men didn't like to talk about it but in one night's engagement 'In-the-slot' she and two other cruisers sank 13 enemy ships among them!

"Anxious in the thought my many close friends have been (and still are) going through very rugged times! Envious of their kind of people—people only found on a ship where the crew have been through what those boys have! Sorrow for the boys who were less fortunate than myself and are not living today to read about the exploits of 'The Lucky Lou!' When a crew can survive three times, then nickname their ship 'The Lucky Lou,' they are indeed philosophical."

My hope is to read more about the development of the campaign to save and memorialize this great ship—and the valiant crew who manned her throughout the war in the Pacific. Because of them—this old sister "Remember Pearl Harbor" every Thanksgiving Day!—BETTY WILBUR, Stapleton.

GRATEFUL FOR LETTER ON SAVING WARSHIP

As spokesman for the officers and men of the USS St. Louis during her lifetime in the United States Navy, I should like to thank Betty Wilbur for her appeal to "Save Lucky Lou" published in the Advance recently.

We are trying to do what the Smithsonian Institution wants to do, thinks should be done, but can't do for lack of funds.

The USS St. Louis is a museum piece in every sense of the term. Slim, fast and beautiful, she is the last of the world's true gunships and considered by many to be the finest cruiser ever built. Built on a 10 to 1 ratio of length to beam, she is slimmer than even some destroyers. Designed to battle it out in surprise gun duels under cover of darkness or low visibility with enemy ships of larger tonnage, heavier guns and longer range, she mounts a forest of turrets and mounts bristling with guns.

The United States has preserved very little of its technical history and paid less attention to its engineers. The St. Louis represented the latest technical advances of the '30s and had many unusual pieces of hardware that were engineering marvels of their time.

How well the St. Louis performed is a matter of record and a legend in the Navy. There are some who think her record equals at least those exploits of any ship since our nation began.

Ironically, if she ends up in the scrap heap in a foreign port, it will happen during America's Bicentennial Year after all the parades and speeches, flag waving and picture taking.

What a way for the Lady to go!—AL SETON, New Dorp.

FUTURE ENERGY DEMAND

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I have been greatly impressed with the recent transformation in our perceptions of future energy growth. Several expert studies completed in 1976 have predicted a much lower total energy consumption between now and the year 2000 than was once thought. In order to explore the assumptions behind these new projections and the former higher ones, I am chairing a briefing by the Environmental Study Conference on Wednesday, February 16, from 2 to 4 p.m. tentatively in room 1310 Longworth. I invite everyone interested in our national energy policy to attend.

The four speakers at the briefing have been chosen to represent a wide range of predictions of future energy demand. They will be: Mr. Edward J. Hanrahan, Director of Analysis at ERDA; Dr. Alvin Weinberg of the Institute of Energy Analysis at Oak Ridge; Dr. Robert Williams of the Center for Environmental Studies at Princeton University; and Mr. Jack Schenck of the Edison Electric Institute.

Mr. Hanrahan represents the office at ERDA which has made detailed projections of future energy growth in terms of various scenarios. The favored version at present, which is lower than their earlier projections, has in the year 2000 total demand around 144 quads and nuclear capacity around 510 gigawatts. Mr. Schenck represents the Edison Electric Institute, which as the spokesman for the Nation's utilities has predicted future electrical growth near 6 percent, close to the historical rate of doubling every 10 years.

Last August, the Institute of Energy Analysis at Oak Ridge headed by Dr. Alvin Weinberg submitted its draft version of an ERDA funded study entitled "U.S. Energy and Economic Growth: 1975-2010". The key finding of their study is a projection of energy demand which is much lower than most previous estimates, especially those of ERDA. There are two scenarios, a low at 101 quads and a high at 126 quads in the year 2000. Approximately one-half of the primary energy goes to electricity generation because of the expected higher price rises for oil and gas compared to coal and nuclear. As they conclude, their estimates are a projection of what is likely to happen in a "surprise-free world" with no drastic changes in life styles and with conservative estimates of the rate of introduction of new technologies and the degree of conservation.

Two important factors in the reduced energy demand are a projected slower rise in real GNP—2.5 percent to 3 percent average annual growth for the next 35 years compared to 3.4 percent since 1940—and gradually increasing real fuel prices. The lower GNP growth is due primarily to demographic trends especially in the fertility rate. In general, the authors have tried to bias their assumptions towards the high side; for example, per capita GNP increases faster than the historical rate and unemployment is low.

Another recent study, entitled "Energy Waste and Nuclear Power Growth," which was undertaken by the Center for Environmental Studies at Princeton University and funded by the Ford Foundation, examines the ERDA-48 energy scenarios and concludes that the end uses of electricity contain considerable waste of both energy and economic resources. Consequently, efficiency improvements which are economically justified by the expected increase in the real price for electricity—opposite to the preembargo trend—can result in a considerable reduction in ERDA's projections. Even the "combination of all technologies" scenario—COAT—which supposedly contains intensive energy conservation, contains so much waste according to the Princeton group that it really represents an upper bound on the U.S. electricity consumption in the year 2000 provided cost-effective efficiency improvements are implemented.

The mix of fuels which supply the electricity is also criticized. The Princeton study claims that the ERDA bias for fission overlooks one very efficient decentralized coal competitor to central station power—industrial cogeneration plants which produce both electricity and steam on site—the latter from waste heat. Assuming the demand in the year 2000 as in the COAT scenario, they estimate that 30 percent of the electricity budget could be supplied by cogeneration, thus halving the number of required nuclear generating plants.

The latter two studies are somewhat complementary, the one concentrating on total demand, with intentional emphasis toward the high side, and the other on electricity supply, with significantly in-

creased emphasis on conservation. Both imply greatly reduced consumption relative to ERDA's past projections.

Even more recently, the massive National Research Council Committee on Nuclear and Alternative Energy Systems—CONAES—has issued their interim report which also sees a slackening of the energy growth rate.

In brief, the committee finds:

A number of factors make it likely that total demand for energy will grow at a lower rate in the future than the historical rate, and that such lower growth is desirable and possible without detriment to other possible goals.

The committee also came to an agreement that there may well be considerable leeway, over the long term, in the amount of end-use energy required for a given amount of growth in the gross national product.

As I am sure you know, projections of energy demand have been used both as a driving force and as a justification for energy supply strategies and timetables. The implications of these low energy growth projections are significant especially regarding the budget priorities for such ERDA programs as the breeder, plutonium recycle, conservation, and alternative energy sources.

Again, I invite everyone interested to attend the briefing on Wednesday, February 16, between 2 and 4 p.m.

OUTSTANDING CONTRIBUTION

HON. DOUGLAS APPELGATE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. APPELGATE. Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to recognize the outstanding contribution to my district by the Mingo Junction Msgr. Dooley Council 4361 of the Knights of Columbus. This is their 20th anniversary and that means 20 years of service to the community.

The members of the Knights of Columbus, utilizing their individual skills as craftsmen, built the Knights of Columbus Hall in Mingo Junction; it serves the entire community and is utilized for a multitude of purposes by individuals and community groups. The whole community benefits from this fine complex.

This council, with a sense of dedication to education of young people in the community, has long sponsored the district's Cub and Boy Scouts. This council provides financial support to St. Agnes Elementary School and Catholic Central High School in Steubenville, as well as supporting the local public high school in various ways.

Mr. Speaker, I consider it a privilege to congratulate all the members of the Knights of Columbus on their 20th anniversary, for their work in educating young people and their service to the community. They have been fortunate to have had the leadership of a truly fine man, Bishop John King Mussio. I look forward to this council's continued leadership in the community.

A NATURAL GAS CRISIS? WHO KNOWS?

HON. WILLIAM J. HUGHES

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, in the 2 years that I have been in Congress arguments rage unabated as to whether or not there is a natural gas shortage or whether it is a price shortage.

The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, to its credit, last year and this year initiated inquiries to determine whether or not producers are producing at maximum efficiency and opening up as quickly as possible new fields on Federal lands, especially in our offshore waters.

However, we still principally depend on unaudited and unchecked figures supplied by the industry itself on estimates of reserves and efforts being made to bring new gas supplies on line. The industry, Mr. Speaker, continues to lobby hard for deregulation and thus has a clear conflict of interest in the supplying of accurate information in my opinion.

That is why I am soliciting support from my colleagues for the creation of a National Commission on Natural Gas Reserves with responsibility for auditing the Nation's gas reserves, undertaking economic studies, and making recommendations for future Federal policy toward natural gas production.

I envision a commission that will be composed of Members of Congress, high level Federal energy officials, and private citizens appointed by the President who have expertise in the field of natural gas, representing the interest of both consumers and producers.

I solicit the support of my colleagues for this legislation. We will never be able to develop a coherent energy policy, let alone a natural gas policy, unless we have reliable information on which to make recommendations. That would be the mandate of the Commission I propose.

I am inserting at this point in the Record a copy of the colleague letter that I have sent outlining the objectives of the Commission:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 4, 1977.

Re Natural gas.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: In the near future, I will be introducing legislation to establish a National Commission on Natural Gas Reserves, with responsibility for auditing the nation's gas reserves, undertaking economic studies, and making recommendations for future Federal policy toward natural gas production.

The legislation is still being drafted, but it will provide that the Commission be composed of Members of Congress, high-level Federal energy officials, and private citizens appointed by the President who have expertise in the field of natural gas, representing the interests of both consumers and producers.

As we well know, there have been numerous charges and countercharges as to the true availability of natural gas, and the level of prices reasonably necessary to encourage exploration and development of gas reserves.

There are many well respected individuals who are contending that the shortage has been contrived in order to force deregulation of gas prices and win even larger profits.

The Subcommittees on Energy and Power, and Oversight and Investigation of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee have conducted inquiries that indicate there is a real need for a comprehensive, independent audit of the nation's gas reserves. At present, the reserve information government must depend upon to evaluate the crisis is supplied solely by the gas-producing industry, which can be said to have a vested interest in higher prices through deregulation.

The Commission I am proposing would develop reserve information independently of any group with a vested interest. Hopefully, on the basis of the Commission's findings and recommendations, we will be able to settle once and for all whether the shortage is contrived, the product of unrealistically low prices, or due to other reasons.

I feel that the time is long overdue for settling the maze of questions that has surrounded the natural gas shortage for the past five years, and the Commission I am proposing would provide us with the answers. If you would like to cosponsor this proposal, please notify Jonathan Spear of my staff, on extension 5-6572, on or before February 10.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. HUGHES,
Member of Congress.

NEIGHBORHOOD POLICY ACT

HON. RICHARD A. GEPHARDT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today the Neighborhood Policy Act. This legislation addresses the need for developing a comprehensive and coordinated policy on neighborhoods. It seeks to establish the Commission on Neighborhoods which would be charged with evaluating the impact of public policies and programs on neighborhoods.

Despite the concerted efforts of many private individuals in the last several years to save inner city neighborhoods of our major cities such as St. Louis, legislation is necessary at the Federal level to demonstrate our commitment to saving neighborhoods as viable places to live and to work. This bill will seek to reverse the present trends of Federal subsidies that encourage new construction but also tolerate if not promote deterioration and demolition of existing, sound, housing stock. We need a comprehensive review of existing laws, policies, and programs which affect neighborhoods and to assess their impact on neighborhoods and recommend modification where necessary.

In the play "Coriolanus" William Shakespeare used the following phrase: "What is the city but the people?" Shakespeare's words are still true today. America's cities, large and small, have lost their people as they have taken an age and the fiscal result has been devastating. The city of St. Louis is a prime example of what happens when the people leave. St. Louis has lost more population over the past 20 years than any

city in the United States. The result has been a continuing local fiscal crisis that seems to defy solution.

The cycle of out migration from older cities is caused, in part, by our rejection of anything old, our desire for anything new, and our propensity to dispose of things after we have used things for a time. It has also been documented that the policies of the Federal Government toward housing has encouraged out migration from our cities.

The significant fact today, however, is that some people's attitudes about our older cities and neighborhoods is changing. Today many young people seek out older homes because of their substantial construction and interesting design. Today many young people seek out older neighborhoods because they are located nearer their employment or because they offer certain amenities that cannot be found elsewhere or because they offer homes that they can afford to purchase.

It is this change in attitude by a significant portion of our population that offers the best hope for the future of our cities. It should be Government's role to encourage and support this new trend as much as possible because the prospect of having hundreds of small and large cities across this Nation that are devoid of people and vast wastelands of empty, deteriorated buildings is unthinkable. Losing our cities means more than losing some important architectural history—it also means the destruction of untold billions of national wealth.

I believe the Congress should declare a national commitment to saving our older cities and neighborhoods. To realize this commitment the Congress should draw and advocate a battle plan to save our cities and neighborhoods which should contain the following:

First, an analysis of the impact of existing Federal, State, and local policies, programs, and laws on neighborhood survival;

Second, an analysis of the patterns and trends of public and private investment in urban areas and the impact of such patterns and trends on the decline or revitalization of neighborhoods;

Third, an assessment of local and regional development plans and their impact on neighborhoods; and

Fourth, an evaluation of existing citizen-initiated neighborhood revitalization efforts and a determination of how public policy can best support such efforts.

The Commission should make specific recommendations for changes in Federal, State, and local laws, policies, and programs to facilitate neighborhood conservation. Such recommendations may include:

First, new mechanisms to promote re-investment in existing city neighborhoods;

Second, more effective means of community participation in local governance;

Third, policies to prevent such destructive practices as blockbusting, redlining, speculation in reviving neighborhoods, and to promote homeownership in urban communities;

Fourth, policies to encourage better maintenance and management of existing rental housing;

Fifth, policies to make maintenance and rehabilitation of existing structures at least as attractive from a tax viewpoint as demolition and development of new structures;

Sixth, modification in local zoning and tax policies to facilitate preservation and revitalization of existing neighborhoods; and

Seventh, reorientation of existing housing and community development programs and other tax and subsidy policies that affect neighborhoods, to better support neighborhood preservation efforts.

VOLUNTARY CITIZEN EFFORTS ENCOURAGED

It is important that we keep in mind that while Federal help is necessary to enable neighborhoods to create comprehensive and more effective policies, the most important element in the resurgence for cities is the voluntary effort of our urban citizens. The voluntary efforts of neighborhood organizations in St. Louis have been more significant than anything Government can do. However, government should encourage and support the voluntary citizen effort in any way possible. The Federal Government has already discovered, through some of its low-income housing projects, that communities cannot be created by Government but that a community is a place created by people due to the desire to live and work there.

JOSEPH WEINTRAUB

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, Joseph Weintraub, retired chief justice of the New Jersey Supreme Court, died last Sunday.

From 1965 until 1973, Mr. Justice Weintraub presided over the court as it handed down some of its most significant and far-reaching decisions.

For many of these he authored the opinions, setting forth in his own courageous way the decision that the system of financing for the New Jersey public schools was inequitable and unconstitutional; upholding the rights of consumers and expanding the civil liberties of all.

Mr. Justice Weintraub combined a firm belief in human liberty with a remarkable ability to preserve the rights of the individual without interfering with the best interests of society.

Often his decisions at the State level set the standard for future rulings by the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, Joseph Weintraub was a man of great character and integrity. He graced the court with his presence, and he dignified his fellow citizens with his work.

Our State and our system of justice will miss his wisdom and his sense of

justice. Those of us honored to call him our friend will never forget his special talent for enriching our lives.

NEW HOPE IN CYPRUS?

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post of February 6 contained a particularly discerning editorial on the Cyprus crisis. I commend it to the attention of the House:

NEW HOPE IN CYPRUS?

What is unique about the Cyprus crisis is the extent to which it is bound up with the diplomatic and political style of one man, Henry Kissinger. This is said not to initiate a round of recrimination, which nobody needs, but rather in the spirit of a remark made many years ago by Henry Stimson, when he was asked, "How on earth can we ever bring peace to the world?" He replied: "You begin by bringing to Washington a small handful of able men who believe that the achievement of peace is possible. You work them to the bone until they no longer believe that it is possible. And then you throw them out and bring in a new bunch who believe that it is possible." Leaving aside how applicable it may be to Mr. Kissinger's frame of mind when he left office, Mr. Stimson's prescription may well be relevant to any number of international disputes and conflicts now seemingly deadlocked. For today, it is enough to note that no sooner had a "new bunch" moved in than, suddenly, the prospects for some movement on Cyprus started looking up. A new American initiative has been launched, with the naming of a special emissary, Clark Clifford, to explore the opportunities for settlement. Almost overnight, the Greek Cypriot majority, huddled in the South, and the Turkish Cypriot minority, settled behind the Turkish occupying army in the North, have started recalculating their odds. So have their patrons in Greece and Turkey. The upshot is that a situation that looked virtually incurable and fraught with peril only a month ago has about it a cast of cautious hope today.

The key has always been in Ankara. As long as Turkey saw that the United States was tying the full resumption of U.S.-Turkish military cooperation to renewed American access to Turkish bases, rather than to progress on healing the Turkish-inflicted wound on Cyprus, then things only got worse. Congress, controlled by forces demanding a rollback of the Turkish occupation of Cyprus, defied Mr. Kissinger on arms and aid for Turkey. The Turks responded by closing bases used by the United States and by edging toward the NATO exit door. Efforts to promote talks on the island got nowhere.

But Mr. Carter said during the campaign, and Secretary of State Cyrus Vance has just restated, that progress on Cyprus must be made before questions of arms and aid can be addressed. Obviously with this in mind, Turkey on Jan. 27 allowed the leader of the Turkish Cypriot minority, Rauf Denktaş, to meet with the Greek Cypriot president, Archbishop Makarios. It was the first such meeting in 13 years, and another is planned on Feb. 12. Various compromise formulas are being discussed to allow the two communities to live side by side in peace under the same governmental roof. The Turkish political opposition is no doubt tempted, as usual, to denounce any display of moderation as a sellout. But there are signs, small but prom-

ising, that the Turks realize that the wind from Washington has shifted and that this may be the time to cut the appalling losses in international prestige, in defense readiness and in access to the European economy that their Cyprus policy has inflicted upon them.

The Cyprus crisis is often perceived as the product of profound ethnic rivalries, which are also held accountable for the host of other problems that have rent Greek-Turkish relations and decimated the eastern Mediterranean corner of NATO in recent years. One does not want to dismiss the ethnic factor: Without it there would have been no crisis. But the proximate cause of the crisis was a flawed American policy, and its solution became hopelessly ensnared in executive-congressional combat. This makes it easier, not harder, to try to fix now. A sensible policy is not only likely to untangle Greeks and Turks but to dissolve the executive-congressional snarl. It is a time for quiet diplomacy and meaningful consultation with Congress. Unlike, let us say, the Arab-Israeli conflict, the Cyprus dispute, for all the bitterness that has compounded it in the past, may not be quite as intractable as it has sometimes been seen—or made—to be.

OUR FREEDOM TO ACCEPT RESPONSIBILITY

HON. BILL CHAPPELL, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech delivered by Mr. John E. Evans, of WESH Television to the Kiwanis Club of Daytona Beach, Fla., on July 21, 1976.

The theme of Mr. Evans' speech deals with "Our Freedom To Accept Responsibility." While the speech was delivered last year during our Nation's Bicentennial celebrations, I am bringing it to the attention of my colleagues because it concerns a subject that we should always be thinking about—the need to continue and increase public participation in the affairs of our Nation. As the speech by Mr. Evans points out, we have the freedom to participate and it is our obligation as free citizens to participate in the affairs of our Government and community life.

The speech by Mr. Evans follows:

OUR FREEDOM TO ACCEPT RESPONSIBILITY (By John F. Evans)

I am honored to take part in your month-long series of programs celebrating the Bicentennial, to be numbered among speakers like Reverend Smith and Dr. Malone, and Reverend Mosley who will be with you next week.

You are fortunate that in Art Zimmet you have the consummate program chairman, he not only calls on potential speakers and flatters them into acceptance, but then thoughtfully provides them with the basis for their talk—or at least he did me, by sending to me a copy of one of Herbert Davidson's daily "Memo from the Editor" items from the Daytona Beach News-Journal which Arthur said he hoped would provide me with a theme for today. In it Mr. Davidson quoted James Reston of the New York Times who quoted a speech from Kingman Brewster, President of Yale, who said that

in his view the first stage of our history was concerned with political freedom, the second phase was concerned with economic freedom, freedom from scarcity, freedom from want. Now, perhaps in 1976, he suggested, there was a chance to reach out to a more positive ideal, to achieve a society of mutual helpfulness, whose greatest aspiration is to give all its members a chance to make a constructive difference in each others' lives.

I am not entirely certain how President Brewster would flesh out these concepts of interpersonal interplay or whether the more conservative among us would react favorably to the sort of society that Herbert Davidson and Scotty Reston might envision arising from Dr. Brewster's concept, but I do welcome the opportunity to talk a little with you about freedoms in our society and about the part that we all, as individuals, play in preserving and expanding them.

It is too easy in this hectic society of ours, and too often in our personal lives, that we are able to ignore or to brush aside with catch phrases or easy labels important elements of the freedoms which have been so much a topic of the oratory which has accompanied this national Bicentennial binge we've embarked upon this year.

In order to talk about our freedoms, past present and future, it is important to look at the system under which they have grown, now flourish and hopefully will be preserved. I've been a little disappointed in many of the Bicentennial dwellings on the Declaration of Independence and the government it spawned, because they've not gone on to connect up that government with our concept of capitalism and the free enterprise system it sustains.

To me, the interrelationship seems clear, for when we talk of capitalism and free enterprise we're talking about:

A system that has made us the most powerful and emulated nation in the world.

A system that assures for each individual a marketplace for his ideas.

A system based on the highest ethical standards of any in the world.

A system which is the backbone for a method of government which more than any other provides the maximum freedoms for all those it seeks to serve.

You may be familiar with a popular comparison of capitalism with other isms of our times—a comparison which uses the ownership of two cows as its basis . . .

Under socialism—you have two cows and you give one to your neighbor.

Under communism—you have two cows, the government takes both and gives you the milk.

Under fascism—you have two cows, the government takes both and sells you the milk.

Under nazism—you have two cows. The government takes both and shoots you.

Under capitalism—you have two cows. You sell one and buy a bull. It is too seldom we stop to think that this capitalistic system of ours, for all the faults we find with it and for all the complaining we do about it gives to us six times as many necessities, comforts and luxuries of life as any other people in the world possess.

And why?

Because we have the freedom to work—to choose our occupations and our place of work.

Because we have the freedom to dream—goals, aims, purposes and desires . . . those of individuals and of groups are an important part of our basic concept of freedom, of our American system.

Under that system it is the total brain power of all the people which benefits the nation.

This is the freedom that permitted Henry Ford to envision cheap, mass production of automobiles.

This is the freedom that permitted Edison

to create the electric light bulb, and this is the freedom that challenges all people to dream, and thus to create, produce and to build.

Hand in hand and equally important is our freedom to compete:

The dreamer has no monopoly on producing things in our society.

The manufacturer must constantly seek ways to make his product better, because if he does not, someone else will market an improved product and his business will fail.

We have the freedom to advance.

Each person is free to improve his position.

Leaders in every field rise to their posts of leadership through the ranks. And it is through this combination of freedoms that our free enterprise system generates its own incentive for the development which must constantly go on to sustain it.

It is through this combination of freedoms that progress is achieved. . . .

That the work week of the average employee has been reduced almost one half in the last hundred years.

That employees wages buy today almost seven times as much as they bought 100 years ago.

That 100 years ago animals did 75% of the production work of the nation, men did 15% and machines did only 10%, whereas today machines do more than 95% of our production work, men less than five.

And so our system has flourished, we have come a long way. We have seen our people largely freed from want, poverty, disease and fear. We have seen the level of illiteracy decline, and we have seen our system forged and defended by brave men and true who laid their principles and their lives on the line at places like Bunker Hill, Gettysburg, The Alamo, The Argonne, Iwo Jima, Heartbreak Ridge and the Mekong Delta. And this is good, for who can quarrel with the importance of being free from want and free from fear?

And yet, despite all this, we stand today, in our Bicentennial year, facing a great challenge which I think President Brewster had in mind and which it seems to me is not so much to our system as to ourselves as individuals, as citizens and as participants in this noble experiment of 200 years duration we call America.

The reason for this challenge is understandable. It is very natural, in an age as scientifically sophisticated and as prosperous as this, that our leaders, political, scientific, yes and even spiritual, should begin to dangle before a dazzled populace another freedom, and that is the freedom from responsibility.

This is a freedom, if we think about it, that none of us really wants. In recorded history there have been many great societies, but that of ancient Greece, of Athens, is probably the best known . . . literate, cultured, happy, peaceful, rich . . . nobody starved. And finally they achieved that last great freedom, freedom from responsibility. And the great society of Athens was no more.

History suggests that the Athenians were not alone, and that in fact nations seem to go through cycles—from slavery to hope, from hope to courage, and from courage to freedom, from freedom to abundance, from abundance to apathy, and from apathy back again to slavery. But all these steps depend on the people who take them. Certainly they are not foreordained.

Greatness in our society stems from individuals achieving to the maximum of their ability and accepting the responsibility to perform in their chosen fields . . . be they housewife, lawyer, salesman, religious leader, educator or whatever—but accepting that responsibility, not abdicating it.

You today, gathered here as participants in the civic life of this community, are rep-

representative of thousands of others, here and throughout this state and nation who are the key to the preservation of whatever greatness our society has achieved and whatever potential it has for the attainment of further greatness, because the mark of a free people is their involvement.

People all over the world, less fortunate than we, would just love to be able to be involved, but they can't. They are free from responsibility. They don't even have to decide who is going to run the country, or the state or the city. No the mark of a free people is participation, and anytime anybody involves themselves in anything in this society, they are defending freedom.

Freedoms, you know, are lost only through disuse. No people ever lost their freedoms when they exercised them. One of the great things about our society that comes into play this election year is that we don't have to vote. We don't have to vote in one party or the other. We don't have to vote at all. A lot of people worried over this in the beginning. How could you make a democracy work without the compulsion implicit in older forms of society? Wise men like Franklin and Jefferson and others decided that in a free society with a well informed, literate electorate, there was hope for a new kind of society—democracy—a republic—a voluntary political society.

This freedom has been lost in other countries because people failed to accept and exercise it. Don't think that because we have in this area an active democratic organization or an aggressive republican organization that this is answer enough.

I don't mean to knock the politicians, for if they didn't exist we'd have to invent them to run our government. But in direct proportion, as we volunteer to work for better government, to participate in the selection and nomination for good men for public office, so do we defend our freedom to choose those who govern us and reject those who should not.

Freedom of worship is voluntary. We are very fortunate that somebody 200 years ago decided that we were not going to have any state religion. This, too, became a matter of the volunteer. The great creeds, Jewish, Catholic, Protestant, that guard the moral and spiritual character of our communities and this country, depend on individual involvement.

In many other countries, church people abdicated this responsibility. The effectiveness of the church in making its contributions has declined, and in some cases disappeared entirely. If we are to protect this freedom, then we must exercise it. We must work and worship in the church of our choice, not merely give money. The parishes that contribute most to the spiritual and moral character of the community are those where they have the maximum number of people supporting the priests, rabbis and the ministers in carrying on this great Christian idea.

In fact, this Judean-Christian idea came into being and survived only because of people involvement. Until the advent of Jesus Christ, state religions were the practice. The state paid for the temples, hired the priests and paid for the festivals.

The people came, looked in awe and enjoyed them. The discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls revealed that others had even before Jesus advanced the concept he embodied. But nobody had volunteered to make it real, to make it live, to make it valid, to make it survive against the kind of statism in religion that existed.

Red Motley, Publisher of Parade, gives a great speech from which I have liberally borrowed, in which he points up how the Apostles were the first volunteers in this great Judean-Christian movement. Without them

Jesus, whether you regard him as great prophet or Son of God, could not have made this idea survive to become the hope of peace for millions of people. They were volunteers against great odds. If you read many of the passages of the Bible about the trials and tribulations of the Apostles which are often omitted from Sunday School Lessons and Scripture Readings, you'll see a picture of toughness on the part of Christ and his Apostles. They had to be tough. He had to be tough to sweep the money changers out of the Temple and to go on foot up and down the narrow breadth of that land in the Near East, being spat upon and stoned and in Christ's case, later crucified.

As we celebrate this 200th anniversary of America, we should be mindful that there exists a direct link between the service we render today and those who laid the foundations of the society we enjoy and must preserve.

Those volunteers who stood at Lexington and Concord made this country possible.

They were outnumbered, too; not only outnumbered by the British, but by their friends and neighbors who didn't go along with the idea of fighting for freedom, against the principle of taxation without representation. If they had looked around them and said, "I don't think I'm going to go along with this because there are so many more people that are against it then are for it," we would still be a colony of Great Britain.

That we are today a free society. That in the eyes of many we are a great society is because from the beginning people volunteered to make an untold political system function reasonably well; to build a God fearing solid people with the church completely free. That we remain so is in large measure because a lot of people like you continue to participate, an act which is in a very real way the highest expression of a free society. Not freedom from responsibility, but the freedom and the willingness to accept responsibility, even though you don't have to do it.

Some of my old cracker friends tell me that if a frog is dropped into a pan of boiling water, he will react so quickly that he will jump out without injury, but that if you take that same frog and put him in a pan of cool water, then place the pan on the fire and bring the water slowly to a boil, that poor frog just won't be able to make his mind to jump until it's too late.

I'm afraid that there are a lot of us today who are like that frog. We've proven time and again that when our freedoms are attacked suddenly and violently, we react swiftly and with righteous indignation. But when the foundation stones of our heritage are slowly chipped away, as many seem to be today, we watch and wait and wonder, and if we're not careful we'll wait until it is simply too late.

It is not hard to be pessimistic about the future of our freedoms and the affairs of our nation. We have seen and heard so much in the last few years, both at the national and state levels of the abuse of power; of immorality in government; or misplaced priorities; of an inflationary economy; of a weakened defense posture and of pressures on the small businessman so varied and so great as to threaten his vital role in our free enterprise system. It would be little wonder if people were turned off by government and overwhelmed by the problems of our times.

And yet they are not . . . and therein lies the optimism with which I hope to leave you today. I suspect that the trauma of Watergate and the other political horrors of these times have, in fact, turned people on to the needs of involvement in government. At the Democratic convention last week, we were treated to a parade of new faces of leader-

ship—more I think than we have seen at any convention of recent memory. In looking over the list of candidates who qualified for various offices around Central Florida before yesterday's deadline, I was impressed with the number of new names and the variety of business backgrounds that composed that list.

In our newsrooms we are seeing stories of more and more efforts by more and more people to take a hand in the shaping of their destiny. We are hearing from more and more civic clubs about their concern in the nitty gritty of government and seeing more and more involve themselves with the nuts and bolts issues of their communities and state. The work of your own Ron Johnson and his public and business affairs committee is a textbook example of this beneficial and encouraging involvement in the leadership you exerted in seeking and obtaining new judges for the county court. You have but to listen to President Bill's announcement for other good examples.

And so I think we are moving in this Bicentennial Year of 1976, perhaps more rapidly than we realize, toward that society Kingman Brewster envisions, which will be based on mutual helpfulness. What's required to accelerate our movement in that direction is, of course, personal commitment by us all to make a conscious effort to give meaning to our role in this new, third century America.

Have you ever stopped to realize that there were about three million people who lived in the colonies at the time of the Revolution. Yet they could get only 56 people to sign the Declaration of Independence. And it took a lot of courage for those 56 because they knew that if it failed, they would surely end up dangling at the end of King George's rope.

And so we became a free people, enjoying a great heritage, because there were those 56 who, on behalf of the other colonists and indeed on behalf of us their descendants and inheritors of freedom, were willing to pledge their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor to this cause.

It is trite, but true, to note that freedom as we know and enjoy it in America demands the acceptance by citizens of the responsibility of citizenship; requires the greatest attainable degree of involvement by us all in the affairs of our government. In your bulletin the other week Bob Montgomery included a quote from Henrik Ibsen noting that "a community is like a ship. Everyone ought to be prepared to take the helm." How many of us would be ready if called upon to take the helm?

Some years ago I clipped a creed published by the National Small Business Association, and on occasions such as this I like to haul it out and reread it. And I would like to leave it with you today as a thought for this Bicentennial month and, if not as a challenge to you in the exercise of your individual rights of citizenship, perhaps as a reminder of the opportunities we all share as Americans. It goes like this:

I do not choose to be a common man. It is my right to be uncommon—if I can. I seek opportunity—not security. I do not wish to be a kept citizen, humbled and dulled by having the state look after me. I want to take the calculated risk; to dream and to build, to fail and to succeed. I refuse to barter incentive for a dole. I prefer the challenges of life to the guaranteed existence; the thrill of fulfillment to the calm state of utopia. I will not trade freedom for beneficence, nor my dignity for a handout. I will never cower before any master nor bend to any threat. It is my heritage to stand erect, proud and unafraid; to think and act for myself, enjoy the benefit of my creations and to face the world boldly and say: This I have done . . . all this is what it means to be an American.

HOUSE SHOULD VOTE ON ITS OWN PAY; COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS SHOULD BE REJECTED

HON. J. DANFORTH QUAYLE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. QUAYLE. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week I appeared before the House Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Presidential Pay Recommendations, Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, to testify in strong opposition to the proposed pay increases. I was afforded the opportunity of stating my views but it is obvious that the Members of the House will not have the chance to vote either "yea" or "nay" because the leadership will not allow a resolution of disapproval to come to the floor for a vote. Time is running out, and our constituents watch with amazement and disappointment.

During the so-called district work period, better known as the Lincoln Day recess, I will have more to say on this issue to the people of the Fourth District of Indiana.

However, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the statement made by me to the subcommittee on Monday, February 7, 1977.

The statement follows:

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee: Thank you for this opportunity to make this statement of opposition to the recommendations for pay increases as recommended by President Ford, with the support of President Carter, and the Quadrennial Pay Commission.

The House has the opportunity to disapprove this ill-timed and inflationary recommendation for exorbitant pay increases for Members of Congress and other high government officials. From reports it is apparent that the House will never have the opportunity to vote for or against this pay increase.

Nonetheless, I sincerely hope that this Subcommittee will bring the resolution of disapproval to the Floor so that all members of the House can go on record, as they should, on this matter of our own pay. Without having a vote on the pay increase matter, the hypocrites of the House will be able to travel home and tell their constituents they were really opposed to the increase but will accept the increase because they don't want to be paid lower than their fellow colleagues.

Hypocrisy like this gives credibility to the low respect our American citizens have for the U.S. Congress.

Today I received a letter from a constituent from Rome City, Indiana, who lamented that 75 percent of the teaching staff receives less than the pay increase which is \$12,900. We are not simply talking about a 28.9 per cent, and almost \$13,000, pay increase for Congress, federal judges and cabinet members. Once this pay increase goes into effect all the bureaucrats will clamor for more money "to keep up with the example Congress has set." This will literally cost billions of dollars.

It is of concern to me that the Congress as an institution continues to rate so low in the eyes of the people of this country. It is beyond me how we can give away to a Commission the responsibility of establishing salaries and not face the issue ourselves. How can we insulate ourselves against inflation without even being required to vote, while our constituents are wrestling every

day with high prices and shrinking pocket-books.

I am opposed to this pay increase for Members of Congress for several reasons. We accepted our positions as Congressmen knowing what our salary would be. Indeed, we campaigned for the job, asked for it, knowing that we would earn a specific amount. I think it is strikingly inappropriate to begin complaining about our salaries and allow a raise in these salaries scarcely weeks after we begin the jobs we worked so hard to get.

Our founding fathers discussed the issue of revising our own salaries during our present term. There was consideration of incorporating into the original Bill of Rights an amendment precluding a pay increase during the term of the sitting Congress. Any pay increase would apply to the next session. Our founders saw the temptation of increasing our pay but rejected the limitations I assume in anticipation of having a Congress interested in serving the people rather than serving themselves.

I believe Congress should decide on its own salaries, but any increase or decrease should take effect only in the term following the passage of such change. This will protect Members of Congress both from those who might try to line their own pockets at taxpayers' expense, and from those who might try to penalize certain factions of this body through a sudden decrease in salary.

It is not only this pay raise which concerns me. The automatic cost-of-living increase is still law and will occur in October if action is not taken.

I am somewhat amazed that we, the highest legislative body of this land, can sit here and pass inflationary spending measures which fall hard upon the taxpayers of this nation, and then promptly arrange it so that we are cushioned against this very inflation.

I do not argue this issue on the basis of need; I argue it on the basis of respect for what used to be an august body. In the early days of the nation, it was an inconvenience bordering on hardship to serve as Congressman—to leave one's family and travel great distances, to maintain both private business and public office, to spend large amounts of time representing the people and never be fully materially compensated for one's efforts. But people were proud to serve as legislators and made these sacrifices because they were more concerned with the welfare of the nation rather than their pay scale.

I was not elected to insure my financial future; I was elected to seek the best interests of the people I represent. This increase is definitely not in their best interest.

If not for this simple reasoning, then for the sake of the reputation of this body, I ask you to vote against these increases . . . by voting out a resolution of disapproval.

PRESIDENTIAL CLASSROOM PROGRAM

HON. TRENT LOTT

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize two outstanding young people, Becky Jo Tedford, of Waveland, Miss., and Tammy Faulkner, of Lucedale, Miss., who were here in Washington last week to participate in the 1977 Presidential Classroom for Young Americans.

It was my pleasure to discuss the operations of our Federal Government with these young ladies, as well as with the entire first class of the Presidential classroom program.

I am impressed by the perception Miss Faulkner, Miss Tedford, and their colleagues displayed toward our Nation's destiny, and I commend these young Americans on their selection to participate in this program.

WOMEN'S AIR FORCES SERVICE PILOTS

HON. LINDY BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mrs. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask the support of my colleagues for legislation I introduced to grant veterans benefits to former members of the Women's Air Forces Service Pilots—WASP's—for their service to their country during World War II.

As many of you may already know, the WASP's served as ferry pilots during the war and many of these brave women suffered death or injury during their service to their country. However, promises to make the WASP's an official part of the military establishment and thereby eligible for veterans benefits were never fulfilled after the emergency of the war subsided. As a result, many of the surviving pilots—approximately 800 are living today—have not been served by the Veterans' Administration as they should have been.

This legislation was originally sponsored in the House during the 94th Congress by our colleague, Representative Patsy Mink. In the Senate, an identical bill has already been introduced by Senator BARRY GOLDWATER. Last year, the Senate amended a veterans health bill, H.R. 71, to provide certain health and hospital services to the living WASP's; however, the House disagreed to the Senate amendment and the proposal was eliminated from the final version of the legislation.

Because the Ford administration and the Veterans' Administration had opposed previous proposals to grant veterans benefits to the WASP's, many Members of the House were rightly concerned about the possibility of a Presidential veto of the entire veterans health bill (H.R. 71) if the WASP amendment were to be attached. I firmly believe, however, that we can expect a more favorable hearing this year. Consequently, I am hopeful that the House Veterans' Affairs Committee will agree to conduct a hearing on this proposal to grant veterans benefits to the WASP's so that committee members and all our colleagues in the House can be fully aware of the justice of this request.

For the information of my colleagues I am pleased to provide the following background on the WASP's and this legislation:

FACTS ABOUT WASP'S

WASPs served in uniform as part of the Air Corps from September 1942 to December 1944.

WASPs who graduated from Air Corps pilot training and flew with the Air Corps: 1,070.

WASPs who died while in service with the Air Corps: 38.

WASPs known to be living at this time (approximately): 800.

WASPs who had additional military service after World War II: 25.

Unofficially we have been informed that the recent decision to admit women pilots into training with the Air Force was based in part on the favorable experience the Air Corps had with the WASPs during World War II.

Duties performed by the WASPs while in the service:

Towing targets for gunnery practice.

Towing gliders for combat glider pilots.

Test flying aircraft as to aircraft and instruments performance.

Flying aircraft in the prescribed manner over hauls.

Flying ground personnel where necessary.

Utility piloting.

Ferrying aircraft from factory or from airport to airport.

It is to be noted that the WASPs flew every type of aircraft manufactured for World War II from the B-19 down to Primary Trainers.

As an indication of the success of the WASP program and in order to discount erroneous claims that WASPs were not top flight pilots, there are two documented cases where WASPs were utilized to prove airworthiness of aircraft which male pilots had considered unsafe:

1. In the ferrying command many male pilots were crashing the P-39 fighter to the point that the plane received the name of "Flying Coffin." To restore the image of the aircraft, General Tunner assigned some of the WASPs the job of ferrying the P-39s, which they did with a perfect flight record. There were no more complaints from the male pilots. (Reference: "Over the Hump" by Wm. H. Tunner; Duell, Sloan, and Pearce, N.Y.: 1964)

2. In the training command during World War II, the male pilots became afraid of the B-26, one of the most difficult aircraft to fly at the time. Again the WASPs were assigned to the training program. They not only flew the B-26 but did it with no fatalities and with fewer "washouts" than the male pilots. The men soon forgot their fear of the aircraft and returned to flying it with great success in combat. (Reference: "Interview with Jacqueline Cochran" by Dr. Murray Green, Office of Historian, USAF, February 25, 1970.)

WASP: MILITARIZATION

It was initially intended that the WASPs would become an active part of the Army Air Forces (AAF), but both the AAF and the WASP Director, Miss Jacqueline Cochran, felt that the program should be observed for a period of time before this move was made. In June of 1943, Miss Cochran approached Colonel O. C. Hobby, Commanding Officer of the WAC, concerning militarization. It was Miss Cochran's approach that a pilot should command the WASPs and not a person unschooled in aircraft or flying, such as Mrs. Hobby. She supported her argument for commissioning WASPs directly into the AAF by referencing a precedent which provided for the appointment of women physicians directly into the Medical Corps of the Army and not into the WAC. Both the Commanding General of the Flying Training Command and the Commanding General of the AAF supported her position.

Colonel T. C. Odum, Deputy Air Inspector, AAF, was given the job by General Arnold to investigate the militarization of the WASPs.

His study dated 5 August 1943 recommended that the WASPs be left on civil service status for a 90-day period of observation, during which time the women would be utilized in military pilot's duties in addition to ferrying aircraft. In July of 1943, WASPs were assigned to tow target squadrons at Camp Davis, North Carolina.

The Air Transport Command in the meantime discovered that Army regulations did not state specifically that an officer had to be male. They therefore considered giving the WASPs direct commission. This plan was killed in the General Staff.

In September of 1943, Representative John M. Costello of California, introduced a bill, H.R. 3358, which provided for the militarization of the WASPs by commissioning them directly into the AAF. The women would be retained until six months after the end of the war. This bill had the complete approval of the Chief of the AAF (General Arnold) and the Secretary of War (Honorable Henry L. Stimson), who submitted a special letter of endorsement of the bill to the Chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs.¹ H.R. 3358, as amended and resubmitted as H.R. 4219, was reported out of Committee on 22 March 1944.

In the meantime, flying training for male pilots was being curtailed. Many civilian contract flight schools using civilian male instructors were being closed down. These men, through the period of emergency, remained at the flying schools, received much better pay, and escaped the dangers of war. Now, they were unemployed. They resented the WASPs flying for the military and brought extreme political pressure to bear on the militarization of the WASPs. The Ramspeck Committee (House Committee on Civil Service) was in sympathy with the male civilian pilots and reported out of Committee a report which was unfavorable to the WASPs.²

On the floor of the House, the WASP bill had very poor treatment. Mr. Ramspeck was in the Speaker's Chair and allowed the debate to degenerate into the discussion of the plight of the male instructor pilots. Various amendments were introduced and passed which weakened the WASP position, and finally, the bill was defeated on the floor. In the meanwhile on the Senate side, Senator Hill introduced a bill with exactly the same wording as H.R. 3358, but after the debate on the House side, the Senate bill was never brought out of Committee.

It is obvious from the above that it was the intention of the Secretary of War and the Commanding General of the AAF, as well as the House Armed Services Committee (then the Committee on Military Affairs), that the members of the WASP be integrated into the military service. The fact that the bill failed can be only blamed upon the activities of certain lobbyists who played upon the lack of knowledge of the subject in Congress, which action allowed interest groups to defeat the bill.

It is interesting to note that during the hearings of the Military Affairs Committee, certain Committee members questioned General Arnold about the male civilian pilots who previously had been happy in waiting out the war with good salaries in the U.S., but now who were complaining to the members of Congress about the fact that the WASPs were to be included in the service.³

¹ "Report No. 1277, 78th Congress, 2nd Session, 22 March 1944."

² "Final Report on Women Pilot Program—To: Commanding General, Army Air Forces"; Pgs. 46 and 47.

³ "Report of Hearing Before the Committee on Military Affairs, House of Representatives, 78th Congress, 2nd Session, on H.R. 4129, 22 March 1944."

General Arnold stated emphatically that no male civilian pilot would be denied a commission in the Air Forces as long as he could meet the requirements (which the women pilots had met), but this was not enough for those supporting the male pilots. The House somehow failed to understand that (although no injustice had been done to the men) by supporting the men, a great injustice would be done to these women pilots.

THE TAX SYSTEM

HON. GUY VANDER JAGT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, a fair, equitable, sound tax system is critical to the economic wellbeing of the Nation. One very important element in our tax structure relates to inheritance taxes. A recent article on this subject by Dr. Peter Gutmann, chairman of the Department of Economics and Finance at the City University of New York, appeared in the Washington Star. I commend this thought-provoking article to the attention of Members of the House:

U.S. NEEDS MORE PEOPLE GOING FROM RICHES TO RAGS (AND VICE VERSA)

(By Peter M. Gutmann)

It is too easy to stay rich and too difficult to get rich. That, to put it bluntly, is what's the matter with the tax system.

The tax system is creating a class system. It establishes a solid barrier to social and economic mobility, upward and downward. Those who aspire to rise in society through work, savings and capital accumulation have much, indeed, most of it taxed away; they have a tough time rising. Simultaneously, those who are already among the top of the heap find it easy to stay there. The tax system keeps those who are down, down, and keeps those who are up, up.

Thus the tax system is a solid bastion of conservatism. It is heavily biased towards the success of past generations. Those whose ancestors became rich, stay rich. Those whose ancestors did not, cannot.

Many draw the conclusion that the solution lies in an ever more egalitarian income distribution. But such is not the case, as many another country has discovered; witness England, not to mention the Swedes who have just cast out their Socialist government after 44 years.

Egalitarian income distribution founders on two rocks. First, substantial problems develop with incentives, productivity and social dissatisfaction. Second, egalitarian income distribution is essentially incompatible with private enterprise, since the public obviously must have the funds to own the country's capital.

The solution is different. In a nutshell, every pauper should have a much-improved chance to become a millionaire, and every millionaire (and his children) should have a much-improved chance to become paupers. Each generation should stand on its own feet.

What does this mean for the tax system? First, it means very high effective estate and gift taxes, but with no tax, or very little tax, for amounts below a certain minimum. The operative principle should be this: No man should be allowed to give another (including his children) enough to permit him a free economic ride at the top of the heap for his lifetime.

Thus, if a billionaire wants to give his offspring his billion dollars, it should be

largely taxed away. If he wants to distribute it equally to 10,000 people, let him. Estate and gift taxes should be levied not on the giver, but on the recipient. If each of 1,000 people wish to give a million dollars to the same individual, it should be largely taxed away. Inheritance and gift taxes should allow downward mobility from one generation to the next.

Second, income taxes should be reduced, not only on the income levels below the median income, or on the income levels of the middle class however defined, but at all levels of income, including upper incomes. This is designed to allow rapid upward mobility within a generation.

The net effect is the stimulation of economic and social mobility, with room at the top of the heap for new blood and room at the bottom for old blood. Men and women of energy could have the opportunity to rise swiftly within their lifetimes, and their children could have the chance to fall equally swiftly. The old adage, "From shirtsleeves to shirtsleeves in three generations" can be cut to two.

Who would benefit? Society would benefit through much greater social and economic mobility. The economy would benefit through greater incentives and output. The typical individual, who today pays taxes to government but receives few desired services, would benefit as his income taxes dropped relative to government services received. Any slack in tax collections could be taken up by inheritance and gift taxes.

This proposal would also give the offspring of the rich a chance to prove themselves, unimpeded by the modern guilt feelings created by inherited wealth.

Tax revisions must meet one criterion: Maintenance of sufficient capital in the hands of the public to own private enterprise. But there would be drastic differences in ownership interests. Under the current tax system, much ownership remains in the same families from generation to generation. Under the new system, ownership would shift to different families from one generation to the next.

The present tax system is an incredible mish-mash. It is neither moral nor immoral, ethical nor unethical, fair nor unfair; it is simply legal. It reflects the accretion of several generations of infighting interest groups. It satisfies no one and probably commands less and less respect. The trouble is that no one considers the tax system just, and probably no one ever will, no matter how often it is revised.

The public seems to agree on only two things: A dollar spent by government for the benefit of a taxpayer is worth less than that dollar spent by taxpayer directly. And a dollar spent by the government for the benefit of a taxpayer (or non-taxpayer) is worth having if someone else pays the taxes. Practically, this means that those who are on the receiving end of income redistribution like it, others don't—hardly a surprising conclusion. Since more are on the giving end than on the receiving end, dissatisfaction is bound to be rife.

It is lucky that the U.S. doesn't have popular votes (like a Swiss referendum) on major expenditures programs tied to the required tax-raising revenue. If it did, few programs would survive. We need only look at the rejection rate of school budgets to recognize this verity. Local school expenditures are certainly among the most popular expenditure programs. From there on, it is almost all downhill.

Congress recently passed an enormous, complex tax revision bill. It is hard to discern any overriding philosophy in this bill, unless it be the plugging of "loopholes," something that means different things to different people. In any case, new "loopholes" seem to be created as rapidly as old ones disappear. It is likely that this bill will prove

little more satisfactory than the tax code it replaces. Indeed, the president-elect has promised yet more tax revisions.

What we need is a philosophy of taxation with some clear objectives. These should include: (1) Social and economic mobility. Let everyone have the opportunity to move rapidly upwards and downwards through the social and economic spectrum. (2) Equality as between generations. Let the offspring of the rich start out afresh. (3) Inequality within each generation. Let everyone reap more of the fruits of his own efforts. (4) Private enterprise. Let the tax system keep ownership of U.S. enterprise in private hands.

(5) Proper incentives. Let no one suffer the negative impact of substantial inherited wealth on incentives to work; let everyone be offered incentives to work for economic rewards. (6) Minimum standards. Let no one sink below a socially acceptable economic norm. (7) Government expenditures. Let the benefit of each government program be related to its cost. Let the total magnitude of government outlays for all programs be related not only to the total magnitude of tax receipts required to finance these outlays, but also to the impact of this total magnitude on the objectives of the tax system. Obviously, we cannot run every conceivable government expenditure program without running up taxes to unacceptable levels.

Without a vision clearer than that embodied in our latest tax legislation, public discontent, disrespect, and distrust will continue to grow. It is time to re-think our tax system.

CONTINUE BROADCASTING IN CLEVELAND

HON. MARY ROSE OAKAR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, Cleveland, Ohio, has often been recognized as one of the ethnic capitals of America. Within the boundaries of my congressional district are representatives of just about every nationality and ethnic group that built this country to what it is today, and these people take a special pride in their ethnic heritage. It is for this reason that I was extremely disappointed with the recent announcement of the Booth Broadcasting Co., which owns WXEN-FM, one of the two ethnic stations in the Greater Cleveland area, of its intention to change the format of the station to contemporary music.

Along with numerous other Clevelanders, I have written to Booth urging that nationality programming be continued, and we intend to pursue whatever other avenues that may be open to us to retain this broadcasting in Cleveland. For the information of my colleagues, I would now like to insert into the RECORD a copy of the letter I sent, and an article from the Cleveland Plain Dealer which describes a huge rally that was held in Cleveland last Sunday to protest this elimination by WXEN of its ethnic programs:

CLEVELAND, OHIO, February 3, 1977.

Mr. JOHN L. BOOTH,
President, Booth Broadcasting Co.,
Detroit, Mich.

DEAR MR. BOOTH: As an individual who was born and raised in the City of Cleveland, I

am greatly disturbed to learn of the decision made by Booth Broadcasting to change the programming policy from "nationality broadcasting" to "top 40 music."

The loss to the ethnic community in particular, and to the Greater Cleveland area in general, will be immeasurable. The sharing of cultures is the foundation of this city, and of many others which are fortunate enough to have people of diverse ethnic backgrounds. This must be preserved in Greater Cleveland.

To so drastically eliminate what has almost become traditional is very difficult to accept.

I find it ironic that your decision should come at a time when the national network, ABC, was willing to gamble programming style and ratings because it realized that the "Roots" of people and their pride far surpass typical business decisions.

Since there is only one other ethnic station in Cleveland and innumerable contemporary ones, it would seem that building on the uniqueness of an already-established format with already-established listeners, embellishing it thus engendering more listeners, would be of a greater service to yourself and the community than to do an almost complete turnaround and to jump into an already-crowded field.

Therefore, I strongly urge you to reconsider your policy change.

Sincerely,

MARY ROSE OAKAR,
Member of Congress.

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer, Feb. 7, 1977]

ETHNIC-POWER RADIO RALLY ATTRACTS 2,000 DOWNTOWN

(By Robert Dolgan)

Chanting "ethnic power" and carrying signs, about 2,000 people rallied yesterday in Public Music Hall against WXEN-FM radio's decision to abandon nationality music in favor of soft rock.

A movement to acquire a new radio station for ethnics was quickly begun. It was sparked by remarks from Tony Petkovsek and Vincent Cardarelli, two of the 21 WXEN disc jockeys and producers to be lopped off the payroll March 12.

The meeting was called by the Nationality Broadcasters Association last week after Booth American Co., owner of WXEN, announced on Jan. 29 that it was changing its format.

"We built WXEN when FM was nothing," said Petkovsek, who has had a Slovenian program since the station was formed in 1961. Now they tell us we're nothing. Let's look into buying a new station or a sub-channel."

Said Cardarelli, host of the Italian program, "Cleveland could have the first station owned by its listeners. If each listener pledged a dollar a month we could do it."

The idea was enthusiastically embraced by the audience and by Mayor Ralph J. Perk, one of a platoon of local and suburban politicians at the rally.

Six persons, including Rep. Mary Rose Oakar, D-20; County Commissioner George Voinovich; Utilities Director Raymond Kudukis; and Euclid Councilman Edward Eckart, pledged \$100 each toward the proposed drive.

"This isn't a wake," said Henry Broze, a WXEN disc jockey who has been in ethnic radio since 1933. "It's a rebirth."

Petkovsek, probably the most influential of the WXEN disc jockeys, said in an interview that it would cost from \$100,000 to \$200,000 to start a new station. He said he thought he could raise \$100,000 from his listeners.

He has conducted radiothons for a Slovenian old age home for several years, raising as much as \$22,000 in one day, he said.

Voinovich cautioned it might be difficult to get another station, and suggested another talk with WXEN owners to try to change their minds.

"If they don't change, hit them in the belly," said Voinovich. "Boycott their new advertisers and make it hurt."

Perk said, "If you in this audience ever decided to boycott a business that was discriminating against you, it could not survive. We too shall overcome."

Miss Oakar said she has had more complaints from constituents about the WXEN change than she has had on any issue since she went to Congress.

Officials of WZAK-FM, another nationality program outlet, have said they will hire some of the disc jockeys.

RECONSIDERATION OF THE COAL SLURRY PIPELINE BILL, H.R. 1609

HON. AUSTIN J. MURPHY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month, I asked to be a cosponsor to Mr. ECKHARDT's Coal Pipeline Act of 1977, the purpose of which is to facilitate the development of coal slurry pipelines for the transport of coal to certain markets.

Since that time, I have exhaustively reviewed and analyzed H.R. 1609, and upon reconsideration of the measure have concluded that as this measure is presently written I must withdraw my support.

Mr. ECKHARDT's bill would provide for the construction of long-distance coal slurry pipelines which would be interstate in nature and would provide for the granting of eminent domain privileges to the owners/operators of such pipelines.

While the concept of coal slurry pipelines merits serious consideration, I believe that the construction and length of such pipelines should be restricted to established regional resource-based boundaries and that further restrictions should be imposed limiting coal slurry pipelines to areas in which adequate transportation facilities are not available, and to areas where the construction and maintenance of a transportation infrastructure as an alternative to pipelines is not feasible. If H.R. 1609 does come up for consideration in the Interior Committee, I plan to introduce amending language to encompass these restrictions.

Furthermore, I hope that the House Interior Committee will not begin serious consideration of Mr. ECKHARDT's bill until the Congressional Office of Technology Assessment—OTA—completes its study of the coal slurry transportation system later this year.

The major economic impact of the present bill would be the transport of western coal via pipeline to eastern markets. This may have a serious impact on the expansion of eastern deep mines and would tend to favor the development of western strip mines, at a time when the Nation's energy policy and needs dictate extensive utilization of deep mined eastern coals.

Coal slurry pipelines used on a re-

stricted basis however could supplement existing transportation facilities without being competitive or detrimental. Limitations could be designed to keep these pipelines within the same functional limitations as existing conveyor systems. By keeping the pipelines in a noncompetitive position, the major carriers such as barges, railroads, and similar carriers would not lose revenues but encourage expansion of service to coal fields. Short-distance restrictions and pipelines would protect regional coal fields and producers from unfair competition by producers from other regions, thereby encouraging full production and full employment within each coal-producing region.

In addition, this would effectively reduce the inefficiency of moving coal into areas already providing adequate supplies to their respective region. Long-distance, large-volume coal slurry pipelines would work at cross purposes with congressional efforts to improve the rail system. A large part of congressional hope for the economic security of the Conrail system is based on the expected revenues from coal hauled to Northeast utilities.

Finally, a cost-benefit analysis of long-distance coal slurry pipelines versus railroad transport indicates that the material costs for upgrading railroads are less than that for a new pipeline; that railroads are more energy efficient than long-distance pipelines, and that railroads are more labor-intensive than pipelines, an important factor, considering congressional efforts to sponsor productive work projects to reduce unemployment.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to take a very close look at the costs and impacts involved before making any final decision regarding coal slurry pipelines.

ICHORD PROPOSES BOUNDARY FENCE AND WEED CONTROL REFORMS

HON. RICHARD H. ICHORD

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, many of the Members may have received numerous complaints, as I have, from farmers who live adjacent to National Forest Service lands about the failure of the Federal Government to participate in the cost and maintenance of boundary fences as well as cooperative programs for the eradication and control of noxious weeds. Farmers are now compelled to bear all the cost of such division fences and the cost of eradication programs.

In an effort to alleviate the unfair burden of such farmers, I am today joined by several Members in introducing a bill to provide for cooperative construction of such boundary fences and control of noxious weeds. There is clear and convincing evidence that activities on national forest lands have contributed to the need for a joint weed con-

trol project. Under this proposal, the Federal contribution to such a cost-share agreement would not exceed 50 percent of the cost of construction and maintenance of fences and eradication of noxious weeds.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM R. ROBERTSON

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, on February 12, a testimonial dinner will be held in Los Angeles to honor a man who has made many important contributions to our community through years of dedicated service. Both management and labor will join in saluting William R. Robertson, executive secretary-treasurer of the Los Angeles County Federation of Labor, AFL-CIO. All proceeds from the affair will be donated to the Kidney Foundation of Southern California—a very fitting gesture on behalf of a man who has never hesitated to involve himself in community affairs.

Born in St. Paul, Minn., on April 4, 1917, Bill Robertson received his education from the St. Paul public school system. His varied background and experience is reflected in the many labor organizations he was affiliated with over the years—including the Mattress Workers, United Auto Workers, Packing House Workers, Hod Carriers and Laborers, Marine Electricians, and the Los Angeles Newspaper Guild.

Bill, as he is known to his many friends, has been a labor leader for 20 years. In 1957, shortly after becoming a California resident, he was elected to head the Hotel, Restaurant and Bartenders Union Local 694 in the San Fernando Valley. Robertson held that post for a highly successful 10 years before joining the staff of the Los Angeles County Federation of Labor, AFL-CIO, in 1967.

In his 10 years with the County Federation of Labor, Robertson has earned a highly respected reputation as a skillful and reasonable negotiator. He was assistant executive secretary when, late in 1975, former Executive Secretary-Treasurer Sigmund Arywitz passed away.

Bill Robertson stepped in, and has more than continued the good work he participated in under Arywitz's leadership. That he is widely respected in his own right, and that the Los Angeles County Federation of Labor is as strong and vital a force as ever, are tributes to Bill's competence, leadership, and ability.

By his own example, Bill Robertson has shown that labor is a strong and vital force that can and should be used for the good of the public. He is a for-

mer member of both the Los Angeles Public Library Commission, and the Environmental Quality Commission. He currently belongs to the Los Angeles city ad hoc committee on energy conservation, and the Los Angeles County economic development program. He is also active in charitable causes, serving as vice chairman of the United Crusade, vice president of the United Way, and is a member of the board of directors of Aid-United Givers.

Mr. Speaker, William R. Robertson exemplifies the belief that organized labor exists for the benefit of all segments of the community. His many activities only demonstrate the fact that he has chosen to become as involved as possible. Currently, two of his major concerns are the relationship between labor and public employees, and the future of California's energy supplies—both issues of obvious importance to southern California and the Los Angeles metropolitan area.

My wife, Lee, joins me in congratulating Bill on his many outstanding accomplishment and good works, and we wish him the best of good fortune as he continues as executive secretary-treasurer of the Los Angeles County Federation of Labor, AFL-CIO.

COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES IN CAMBODIA

HON. TRENT LOTT

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, please permit me to call to the attention of my colleagues and other responsible Americans a letter which I have recently received. I have read the article cited in this correspondence and think that it is worthy of note. Therefore, in lieu of entering the entire commentary, I am taking this means of sharing the concerns of my constituents about the activities of the Communists in Cambodia:

KEESLER AFB, Miss.,
January 24, 1977.

HON. TRENT LOTT,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: Respectfully request that you read into the Congressional Record the article, "Murder of a Gentle Land", in the February 1977 Reader's Digest. The American people and especially our elected leadership need to be profoundly aware of the consequences when we as the strongest free nation on earth fall in our moral and leadership responsibilities. It is always unfortunate that others less fortunate than ourselves must pay for our mistakes. Should we fail to stand by all free peoples in their hour of need, then we have ultimately failed not only ourselves but all future generations of Americans.

Very truly yours,

William P. Saunders, Jr., Victoria K. Byron, Charles D. Fleck, John G. Kellholz, Edward P. Lapham III, William R. Lemaster, David C. MacDonald, Mary E. Martin, Francis P. McNeil, Sr., Stephen F. Sorensen.

THE BLACK ELECTORATE, A CONTINUING STRUGGLE

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, it may be ascertained that the election victory of Jimmy Carter in November is due primarily to the tremendous support given him by the various minorities, particularly the black minority. It was the overwhelming black voter turnout in various key States that gave President Carter his winning margin.

This support reflects the trust placed in Mr. Carter's ability to fight unemployment, provide adequate housing, and help secure a meaningful and productive lifestyle in America. The right to vote which so many of us struggled in the 1960's to obtain has now become an exercise in the search for a promise of the future. We believe that Mr. Carter is our promise for the future—a promise of greater equality and opportunity, of less discrimination and injustices. Myself and other blacks have banded together to make every effort to continue in this struggle. That the black people should elect a man from the Deep South to our Nation's highest office is reflective of the distances we have traveled to overcome the barriers of the past.

I would like to submit, Mr. Speaker, the following article taken from the editorial page of the Crisis, December 1976 issue, which details the role played by blacks in the November election. I hope it will serve to illustrate the important contribution blacks played in helping to shape the mandates President Carter will use in the future. The editorial is as follows:

THE BLACK VOTE: BALANCE OF POWER

Next month, Jimmy Carter will become the 39th President of the United States. It is generally conceded by both major political parties and by an assortment of pollsters and pundits that he owes his election to the nearly total support given to him by black voters across the nation. In so favoring Mr. Carter, black people were expressing their belief that this man from the South possessed an awareness and concern for the problems of black and other minority people.

No Southerner has been President since before the Civil War. The reason seems to have been that the major portion of the country viewed the postbellum South as slow, backward, unenlightened, inflexible, prejudiced, impoverished, ignorant, and possessing few redemptive qualities, and no potential Presidential candidate could come out of such an environment.

The beginning of a change came with the altered status of the Negro which began with the Supreme Court decision of 1954 in *Brown v. Topeka Board of Education* which overturned the separate but equal doctrine of the land.

Nearly two decades of massive civil rights activity followed—sit-ins, freedom rides, civil disobedience, direct action, passive resistance, and freedom marches, culminating in the magnificent March on Washington of 1963 for jobs and freedom, the 1964 Civil Rights Act, the Voting Rights Act of 1965, and the Fair Housing Act of 1968. In the interim, the old South died, slowly and sometimes painfully. Yet the desegregation which occurred in the process became more complete and

more sincere, in some instances, than that which was taking place during the same period in the North.

A new South was born—one in which black and white children attended public school together, one in which black citizens began to be elected to public positions at all levels of government, and one in which the historic familiarity between black and white people began to turn into a relationship of mutual respect.

Mr. Carter is of that new South, and black folk all over this nation knew it. Because of their conviction that this former Georgia governor would be a President who would do something about the concerns of minority people, black voters provided him with a margin of victory in several key states. In Pennsylvania, for example, Mr. Carter received 90.5 per cent of the black vote; in Ohio, 91.5; in Texas, 96.9; in Missouri, 90.8; in Maryland, 91.7; in Louisiana, 93.4; in Mississippi, 91.7 per cent. And in New York, where the upstate vote favored Mr. Ford, the overwhelming minority vote cast for Mr. Carter in New York City provided the margin of victory. In the city, 94 per cent of the black vote went to Mr. Carter.

It is obvious that black voters, in this election, have placed their trust in the integrity and commitment of Mr. Carter. It is equally obvious that they expect him to keep his commitment to attack the high rate of unemployment which pervades the country generally and Negro communities disproportionately. It is obvious, too, that they expect him to foster the construction of low- and middle-income housing, counteracting particularly the blight and desolation of urban centers.

"So black people are justifiably proud," Vernon Jordan, executive director of the National Urban League, has said. "They elected a President, made use of the previous right to vote that was bought so dearly in the struggles of the 1960s, and used that right with skill and comprehension."

Mr. Jordan went on to say: "It is one thing to get elected, and quite another to govern. We must concern ourselves with governance. No matter how personally concerned about race relations the President-elect may be, once he gets to Washington and faces the political pressures of the office and the necessary compromises that are part of the democratic process, he may find it expedient to defer those programs of vital importance to black people."

We agree with Mr. Jordan that "we must not allow this." Without reservation, we agree.

There is a realism, however, which we must keep in mind if, as black people, we are not to permit high expectations to become exaggerated out of proportion. What we expect of Mr. Carter is that he will use the full weight of his office to provide equal rights for black citizens in his government, in employment generally, in housing, in education, and in each of the areas where black citizens previously have been given short shrift. But he will be President of all the people and realism dictates that he can do these things only as part of governing the total country. While Mr. Carter carries a heavy obligation to black Americans, he must repay that obligation at the same time he reaches for the general welfare.

There is an undeniable bond between Jimmy Carter and black people. And it is a fascinating twist of fate that these black people, who once had been enslaved so cruelly by whites of the South, should today select a latter-day Southerner in whom to place their faith, with a totality never accorded any recent Presidential candidate. The magnitude of that support puts Mr. Carter in the position of being the first President to owe so much to a single minority. An irrevocable partnership has been

formed. Mr. Carter must support that partnership from the vantage point of the White House. We must support it from our various civilian positions with all the energy, imagination and clout that we can muster.

NAACP Administrator Gloster B. Current credited the victory of Mr. Carter, in the Presidential election, to the "overwhelming support he received from black and lower-income voters."

Mr. Current noted that the NAACP, through its 1,700 local units, conducted non-partisan voter education campaigns to get out the vote. In his statement on the election, he said:

"The victory of Gov. Jimmy Carter, in the Presidential election, was achieved with the overwhelming support he received from black and lower-income voters. No Presidential candidate in recent memory owes as much to these particular groups of voters for their election as does President-elect Carter.

"The NAACP, as a non-partisan organization, did not endorse any candidates in the national elections. Nevertheless, the NAACP did present its official positions on the many critical social issues with which the nation was faced before the platform committees of both party conventions. NAACP members throughout 1,700 local units and youth chapters were well aware of these positions and advised to vote for those candidates whose positions most closely matched the civil rights organization's.

"As the results in the Presidential election showed, black voters will respond and turn out at the polls when they feel there is a clear choice between candidates. They were presented with a clear choice on November 2, 1976, and they acted accordingly.

"The heavy turnout of black Americans at the polls November 2 again points up the importance of stepping up our registration and voting efforts because both parties have to be reminded constantly that their interest in minority communities is best served by dealing with the economic problems of the poor, the disadvantaged and the citizens who are affected by the decline and fall of the economy."

In the final debate between the two Presidential candidates, on October 22, Mr. Carter stated:

"I think the greatest thing that ever happened to the South was the passage of the civil rights act(s) and the opening up of opportunities to black people—to have a chance to vote, to hold a job, to buy a house, to go to school, and to participate in public affairs. It not only liberated black people, but it also liberated the whites."

We heartily agree.

IDAHO LEGISLATURE RESCINDS ERA

HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce to my colleagues in the Congress that on Tuesday February 8, 1977, the Legislature of the State of Idaho voted to rescind its previous ratification of the proposed equal rights amendment to the U.S. Constitution. This action by the Idaho Legislature is a victory for the women of America, for if the ERA should become operative women in our society would in all likelihood be reduced to the same status as men.

VFW VOICE OF DEMOCRACY ESSAY WINNERS

HON. HENRY J. HYDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I was honored last month to participate in the awards presentation in my district for local winners in the Veterans of Foreign War's annual Voice of Democracy contest. I take great pleasure in announcing that the first place winners in that competition were Miss Margaret M. Brassil of Immaculate Heart of Mary High School and Miss April Hochevar of Proviso West High School.

This competition was cosponsored locally by the Bellwood Memorial Post 5081 and Ladies Auxiliary; Riverside-North Riverside Post 6868 and Ladies Auxiliary; Grant/Parkholm, Cicero, Post 9115; Westchester Post 1249 and Ladies Auxiliary; Hillside Memorial Post 3590 and Ladies Auxiliary; and the Ding-A-Ling Pup Tent No. 71 Military Order of Cooties.

I commend Miss Brassil and Miss Hochevar for their first place winning essays, and I take great pleasure in sharing their thoughts on "What America Means to Me" with my colleagues:

WHAT AMERICA MEANS TO ME

(By Margaret M. Brassil, Immaculate Heart of Mary High School)

There is one dominating force that has shaped the course of events of American history. At the beginning of our nation this force caused our founding fathers to resist the tyrannies they had experienced under the King of England. This force fired the shots at Lexington and Concord. Next, this force wrote the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States. Two hundred years later, this force caused a President and most powerful man in the world to resign from office. This force is the American people!

In 1776 the people created this new nation out of the desire for freedom and liberty. Since then Americans are born with a special spirit and sense of the power of the people and a feeling for the beauty of our country. In the 18th Century, St. John de Crevecoeur wrote of Americans as being a new breed of Men. He wrote of the nation as a melting pot of all races and creeds, a nation in which the combinations of the world come together as one.

We are a special breed, for we realize our strength as a people and without knowing it, without ever even thinking about it, we express this in classrooms, at rallies, in newspapers, in speeches and in common day conversation with people. America is the strength of all that is good in her people. For from the beginning, from those first immortal words—"We the People"—it was the people who decided their nation's fate. They built her up and created her laws, they defined the dictators and power-seekers, and, they shunned anyone who tried to take away their rights.

America's ideals of Freedom, Liberty and Equality stand for nothing, if they are not strengthened and made visible by the people. For America is not simply mountains and fields and forests. She is not just clear skies, sparkling water or rich soil. America is the people—the businessmen, clerks, politicians, entertainers, educators, students, housewives, shopkeepers and the people from every strata

of life, from cities, farms and villages, factories, fields and shops; with the right to express themselves in their religion, speech, press and assemblies.

America is what her people desire her to be—Free and Independent. Through all the troubled times and the good times we continue to grow, to build, to share, to ensure the Rights of Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Happiness for our fellowman and all future Americans.

WHAT AMERICA MEANS TO ME

(By April Hochevar, Proviso West High School)

America—What Is America? What does she really stand for? Is she, like many Americans believe, a land of big business and industry? Is she a land where violence and injustice dominate society? Or is she the physical image of our Forefathers' dream of a land of equality and brotherhood?

America was founded on the strong convictions and ideals of our Forefathers who believed that all men should live in freedom. But what does freedom really mean? Is it merely being independent from an oppressive government? Surely it is more than this. Freedom is the right of a man for self-expression and self-achievement. Every man should have the opportunity to reach his goals and to fulfill his dreams. On the other hand, his goals will only be achieved by the amount of effort he exerts. The poverty-stricken need the opportunity to rise above their impoverished conditions. Those socially discriminated against need encouragement to reach their goals in life through self-determination.

Although the Constitution guarantees inalienable rights to its citizens, it is up to us, the people of America, to make certain that this document is a statement of fact, and not just eloquent, meaningless words. America has faced and dealt with many problems in the past 200 years. America has always had enemies within the world. But perhaps her most dangerous enemy is herself. The words of Abraham Lincoln seem to echo quietly in the back of our minds, "a house divided against itself cannot stand." These words, although stated many decades ago, should alert us to the dangers we could face.

America, even at the beginning of her establishment, dealt with inner conflicts. The first colonies in America wanted to become 13 individual nations, rather than the United States. Yet, as the months passed, it became obvious that in order to survive and to remain free, the 13 colonies had to unite into one nation. A nation with many different voices, but always with the same goal—freedom.

America today speaks with many different voices, but is her main goal still freedom? Have we become so involved with ourselves as individuals that we can no longer unite as one? Have we lost sight of what freedom really means? Perhaps because most of us have lived in America all of our lives, we take for granted the privileges that should be so dear to us. We tend to look at all the bad aspects of our society, without realizing that good things do exist. Perhaps it would benefit all Americans to look at their country through the eyes of a new comer—an immigrant. The immigrant has come here because he has heard that in America there is hope—hope for a man and a woman, and a future for their children. The time has come for America to wake up. The minutemen of the American Revolution rode through the country alerting the people of the approaching enemy—the British. Perhaps today we need minutemen to ride through the country and alert us of a more frightening enemy—the apathy of our own people.

Now is the time for each American to open his eyes and to be realistic about his country. America is not a perfect country. And

yet her basic foundations were adorned with two interweaving concepts—freedom and hope. We stand as a guiding light to all those seeking a land where they can work towards their goals and dreams. America is a land of beginnings, and with each beginning there is hope. We have the chance now to rekindle the torch of freedom and to carry it onward. Liberty welcomes the tired, the poor, the huddled masses yearning to be free. To the poor and oppressed people of the world, America is the burning torch of freedom. To me, America is hope. If we can rekindle the flame of hope in every American's heart, then we will have a rebirth of freedom. The eyes of the world will behold America, a glorious land of freedom and hope.

AMERICAN DOUBLE STANDARDS ON AFRICAN ISSUES AT THE U.N.

HON. CARLISS COLLINS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to bring to the attention of my distinguished colleagues a penetrating analysis of the espousal by African nations of what are frequently pointed to by outsiders as conflicting economic and political goals. Printed January 22, 1977, in the New York Times under the authorship of James H. Mittelman, assistant professor in the Columbia University Department of Political Science, the following article focuses on the need for the United States to understand why African nations must fight their battles for independence on two seemingly contradictory fronts: Continuing to trade with countries practicing apartheid while denouncing these countries through the United Nations forum.

If this situation appears hypocritical to my colleagues, I call their attention to the delicate balance in existent U.S. foreign policy involving our importation of Rhodesian chrome and our simultaneous negotiation to levy economic sanctions against South Africa.

The following article explains this double standard in African policy. I believe the understanding of both historical and current African problems expressed herein is of inestimable value to all who are interested in improving the quality of U.S. relations with the people of Africa:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 22, 1977]

AMERICAN DOUBLE STANDARDS ON AFRICAN ISSUES AT THE U.N.

(By James H. Mittelman)

Americans have had a shortsighted view of African issues at the United Nations. Our ambassadors have contended that it is hypocritical for Africans to attack South Africa's policy of apartheid while committing genocide in their own countries. As evidence of double standards, Mozambique is often mentioned as a prime example of a country that condemns apartheid and continues to trade with South Africa. Though superficially correct, this argument lacks historical perspective and misconceives the challenges facing the international organization.

It is true that violence is widespread south of the Sahara, and several African countries' dealings with South Africa are flourishing. But the important question is, why?

To protect their interests in Africa late in

the colonial period, Western powers bolstered privileged classes and select ethnic groups. After the accession to political independence, representatives of these same groups have been responsible for making the decisions to maintain ties with South Africa.

The "haves" oppress the "have-nots" at home, and frequently derive support from multinational corporations, aid programs and international monetary institutions. At the same time, the rich and the powerful seek to establish credentials with their own people by using anti-imperialist rhetoric and calling for forceful measures against white-minority regimes.

Unlike many countries in Africa that became politically independent through a constitutional conference or referendum, Mozambique did not accede to statehood by accommodation. Rather, the Mozambique Liberation Front waged guerrilla warfare for a decade against the longest-lived fascist regime in history. After 500 years of Portuguese colonialism, Mozambique won independence on June 25, 1975.

Contemporary patterns of economic dependence, such as the convention (first signed in 1909) providing for a minimum of 100,000 laborers to work in South African mines every year, were forged by the colonial state, not by the Government of Mozambique. The legacy of colonialism was an economy in shambles, including a deficit in balance of payments in 1974 that had deteriorated to the extent that imports could only be assured for seven days.

Despite the critical state of the economy, in March 1976 the Mozambique Liberation Front closed the border with Rhodesia, 60 percent of whose foreign trade was routed through Mozambique's ports. The direct loss to Mozambique in rail and port revenues is estimated at \$165 million for the first 12 months.

While Mozambique would also like to cut its ties to South Africa, economic realities do not allow that option. For a country that derives nearly 50 percent of its foreign-exchange earnings from South Africa, such a move would be suicidal. Economic relationships established over centuries of colonialism cannot be changed overnight.

Like Mozambique, other African countries do not have the strength to rectify the situation in Southern Africa. Hence, they rely on their aggregate voting power in the United Nations General Assembly.

To those who bemoan the gap between General Assembly resolutions and their implementation, a partial answer is that international institutions are intended to distort the status quo. If they merely mirrored the distribution of power among member states, there would be little need for them. The key question—and a contentious one—is whether decisions made in the United Nations affect existing differences positively or negatively.

The claim that the gulf between resolutions and effective implementation is due to automatic voting majorities underplays the responsibility of individual member states to honor the expressed will of the world body.

It is not only those resolutions adopted at the behest of small states contrary to the intentions of the great powers that remain unimplemented. In the case of United Nations action against Rhodesia, for example, in 1968 the Security Council unanimously adopted Resolution 253 calling for mandatory sanctions. Yet the United States, a permanent member of the Security Council, and hence with primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, has wilfully violated sanctions by importing chrome.

The implication of the double-standards argument are unclear. Would the United Nations be in a better position if it did not take a stand on burning social issues? The re-

sponse of the majority of member states is that certain affronts to human dignity—namely, colonialism and apartheid—are so fundamental that the United Nations must seek to establish a climate of opinion favoring change, even if it is unable to provide a solution.

Insofar as there are double standards, the worst offenders are those who fail to distinguish causes and effects. Understanding history is the first step toward revamping our foreign policy.

CHARTER 77

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, recently over 200 Czech citizens signed their names to an important document entitled, "Charter 77." This statement, calling for the extension of human rights in Czechoslovakia, also symbolizes the struggle of other nations under Soviet domination, who wish to regain their freedoms.

However, the issuance of this document did not meet with the approval of the Government of Czechoslovakia, and it has been reported that the signers of this charter would be punished by imprisonment or deportation.

As we recess today to pay tribute to the memory of a great American, Abraham Lincoln, who wanted freedom for all people, I believe it is especially important that we direct our attention to this recent violation of human rights.

AFL-CIO President George Meany issued a press release in protest to the unfair harassment of the individuals involved in the signing of the charter. I insert it in the RECORD at this time for the Members' attention:

STATEMENT BY GEORGE MEANY, AFL-CIO PRESIDENT

AFL-CIO President George Meany today issued the following statement urging the government of the United States to press in the United Nations a motion of censure and expulsion of Czechoslovakia for human rights violations:

The vicious persecution of Czechoslovakian citizens for no crime other than an appeal to their government to live up to its laws and treaty obligations and to cease its gross and cruel violations of the most fundamental human rights warrants the condemnation of the civilized world.

A manifesto entitled "Charter 77", signed by 257 courageous and eminent Czech citizens, was delivered to the communist authorities in Prague on January 6, 1977. It carefully documents, with facts and cases, the systematic pattern of oppression and fear which rules that country. It measures those tyrannical practices, not against abstract or visionary ideals or goals, but against the precise terms of the Czechoslovak Collection of Laws, which includes the text of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, signed by Czechoslovakia in 1968 and confirmed at the 1975 Helsinki Conference.

Charter 77 establishes beyond a doubt that Czechoslovakia today is not a civilized nation governed by law, but one great concentration camp for the punishment of in-

nocents, run by the criminals at the point of Soviet guns.

If basic human rights mean anything at all to the United Nations, Czechoslovakia must be called to account before the General Assembly, and the public testimony of the gallant signers of Charter 77 must be heard in that world tribunal.

The AFL-CIO calls upon the government of the United States to offer and press a motion of censure and expulsion of Czechoslovakia so that its shocking offenses against its own laws and its solemn commitments to the laws of man may be pursued and subjected to that due process which it so flagrantly denies its citizens.

FEDERAL AID TO ELEMENTARY EDUCATION MEANS FEDERAL CONTROL AND FRUSTRATING THE EXPRESSION OF DIVERSE LOCAL VALUES

HON. DAVID C. TREEN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. TREEN. Mr. Speaker, this Congress will consider the extension of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and the National Education Association's efforts to increase the level of Federal assistance to one-third of the total cost of elementary and secondary education. I think this is a matter that deserves very careful study by the Congress.

I would like to begin the congressional dialog on this subject by bringing to the attention of my colleagues articles by men who very rarely agree. One is Albert Shanker, president of United Federation of Teachers, who in the attached column of March 24, 1974, stated:

While fear of losing federal dollars silences protests, it is too early to tell who were right in their historic debate—the liberals or the conservatives. If timid acquiescence continues, those who feared that federal aid means federal control will have been proven right.

The other is the editor of National Review, the conservative biweekly, who in its January 7, 1977, issue suggests that increasing Federal assistance at a time taxpayers are turning down bond issues for schools will frustrate the attempts by the public to bring public education into line with the values of the general population.

[Paid advertisement from the New York Times, Mar. 24, 1974]

MUST FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION MEAN FEDERAL CONTROL?

(By Albert Shanker, President, United Federation of Teachers)

In the period extending from the end of World War II until legislation providing federal aid to education was finally passed during the administration of President Lyndon B. Johnson, the American people witnessed a lively debate on the aid-to-education philosophy. The debate involved many different issues, prominent among them being aid to private and parochial schools and to segregated schools and districts. But the basic conflict was between "liberals" and "conservatives" over the issue of whether federal aid would lead to federal control of schools.

Liberals generally argued that federal aid

would not lead to such control or, to the extent that the federal power of the purse was exerted, it would be used to promote beneficial national educational objectives that would supplant discriminatory and parochial local interests. As we look back at that debate from the vantage point of 1974, it would seem that the old conservatives were not far off base.

In the last few years, in the course of conflicts over a number of issues, federal agencies have threatened to cut off funds, and have actually done so, in some instances.

Universities are threatened with a loss of federal funds unless they employ staff on the basis of racial minority quotas.

School districts are threatened with the loss of funds unless they administer tests requiring children to respond to racially inflammatory questions such as, "Do you think black [or 'brown' or 'white'] students in this school cause more trouble than other kinds of students?"

School districts are threatened with loss of federal monies if they fail to cooperate in the development of reading and mathematics tests which would set racially separate learning standards.

The U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare threatened New York City with a loss of \$200,000,000 in federal aid if it refused to cooperate in its most recent research project in which 100,000 New York City students would have been individually identified in a vast computerized data bank storing educational, ethnic and family information.

NEW YORK'S FIGHT AGAINST FEDERAL IMPROPRIETY NEEDS ALLIES

Most colleges, universities and school districts have quietly submitted to these federal pressures, thus tending to confirm the conservative prediction of eventual federal control.

Fortunately, there has been one exception: New York City. The City's Central Board of Education and a number of its decentralized community school districts have demonstrated that one can—and should—fight against unreasonable demands from Washington.

The New York City Board of Education and Community School Board No. 19 sued the Department of HEW in federal court on the issue of the racist questionnaire. The result: HEW bowed to the objections and withdrew the questionnaire—not only in New York but all across the United States.

Similarly, because of defiance by the New York City Board of Education and by District 19 and District 12, plans to develop racially separate reading and math standards have been dropped.

The New York City Board of Education refused to allow individual students to be identified in the federal computer data bank. Board President Seymour Lachman contended that the federal demand for pupils' names "violated the confidentiality of student records... these kids could have been categorized, codified and stereotyped for life on the basis of information put on tape while they were in elementary school." Board member Joseph Monserrat pointed out that the school system welcomed federal research, but "If the Government wants to do research to see how our programs are working or what our weak points are—and they should—they do not need the names of actual pupils, just the pertinent data." And once again, HEW backed down, saying, "It was all a misunderstanding. Perhaps it was our fault." [Even with pupils' names deleted, the proposed study is designed to make the schools the target of blame, since it will include data on race, achievements, school groupings, and school facilities, but will not include data on family status, family income, mobility and other non-school factors which relate to achievement.]

New York City's school people have acted with courage; they have shown that resist-

ance to improper federal interference can be successful. But why must New York stand alone in this fight? Where are the protests from other cities, school districts, Boards of Education, teachers, parents, supervisors, and superintendents? While fear of losing federal dollars silences protests, it is too early to tell who were right in their historic debate—the liberals or the conservatives. If timid acquiescence continues, those who feared that federal aid means federal control will have been proven right.

New York has shown that this need not be so. Let us hope that some new improper action by federal agencies will not find New York City carrying on the good fight alone. It is time for the rest of the nation to join in.

[From National Review, Jan. 7, 1977]

DE-SCHOOLING AMERICA

So far schools have actually been shut down only in Oregon and Ohio, but elsewhere the signals are only slightly less auspicious. New York and New Jersey saw school budgets defeated in record numbers this year wherever the voters had a say (29 per cent rejection by voters in New York, 58 per cent in New Jersey). Other states—Washington, California, Michigan, Missouri—show a similar pattern emerging. Early in December, the schools in the Toledo, Ohio district, with a total of 56,000 pupils, ran out of money and had to close up shop until the new year. For the last eight years Toledo voters have been rejecting tax increases designed to meet rising costs of education.

No doubt these votes indicate a general resentment of ever higher taxes, but they also seem to reflect a widespread perception of the way in which the schools have been aggrandizing their role in American life. It has amounted to a culturally imperial thrust. The schools have moved in the direction of the claim that all of life falls within their purview, not only offering instruction in the usual academic subjects—with decreasing effectiveness—but reaching out to embrace sex education, driver training, vast athletic programs, artistic experiences of all kinds, alleged solutions to racial problems, free lunch, medical care, liberation of the self in various directions, attitudes toward current events, and so forth.

The schools have not only extended themselves laterally, into all areas of the culture, but they have been pressing back the chronological boundaries as well, school from cradle to grave—"pre-school" education (in school, of course), adult education, and even the geriatric curriculum.

Not infrequently, moreover, the attitudes represented in the schools have been at odds with the values of the general population—as in the extrusion of even voluntary prayer, the banning of Christmas carols, the requirement of "value neutral" sex education, bus-ing, and so forth.

Recent votes on the subject indicate that the citizens are beginning to stand athwart this entire process and say "Enough," and even "Too much." No doubt the Education interest will attempt to shake the local dust from its feet and betake itself to the federal treasury. Stay tuned for the coming phases of this struggle.

LOWENSTEIN APPOINTMENT AUGURS WELL FOR HUMAN RIGHTS PRIORITY

HON. DOUGLAS WALGREN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. WALGREN. Mr. Speaker, one of the great lessons of the past decade has

been the need to bring American foreign policy clearly into line with the principles and ideals on which this Nation was founded. Wrote de Tocqueville:

America is great, because America is good. When America ceases to be good, America will cease to be great.

The belief that we should stand for certain moral and spiritual values around the world is a source not of weakness, but, ultimately, of the deepest kind of strength.

During his campaign last fall, President Carter spoke this message forcefully and well. Its realization now depends largely on the quality and character of the men chosen to direct our foreign policy. That is why events like the appointment of Andrew Young add so much to the hope for more promising directions in international cooperation.

On Monday I joined many of my colleagues in attending the swearing-in of a man who symbolizes as much as anyone those qualities which the United States should represent around the world. I speak of former Congressman Al Lowenstein, who is now en route to Geneva, to head the U.S. delegation to the United Nations Commission on Human Rights. That a man of such stature and brilliance was selected for this position bodes well for the administration's intention to give questions of human rights the priority they deserve.

Al Lowenstein brings to this post a record almost unparalleled in the selfless and effective pursuit of social justice. His leadership in the movement for civil rights was early and sustained. His eloquence and conviction on behalf of the cause of peace won him respect, around the country and here on the floor of this House, even from those who disagreed with him. His devotion to fairness and decency in public life has led him into battles against very long odds.

This record of commitment has encompassed international as well as domestic issues, including diplomatic and United Nations concerns.

As a leader of American students in the early 1950's, Lowenstein was an effective and independent voice for democratic values, then under attack by Communists in international student organizations. Later he worked closely with Eleanor Roosevelt in her activities with the U.N. At the end of that decade, he traveled to South Africa and Namibia, at considerable risk, to report on native conditions concealed from the outside world. He and his party were the first Americans ever to address the U.N. Fourth Committee on behalf of a colonial people, and his prophetic book, "Brutal Mandate," forecast the dangers presently unfolding in Southern Africa.

During the 91st Congress, Lowenstein traveled at his own expense during congressional recesses to many countries where popular aspirations had been suppressed. Whether in the Mideast or Spain, Moscow or the Dominican Republic, his commitment to fairness and human dignity has convinced many of the promise of the United States.

The issues with which the Human Rights Commission will deal this year are not simple, nor can they be solved

with good motives alone. The choice of Al Lowenstein as our spokesman at these talks has added a force of tough-mindedness and insight. Few men have shown greater capacity for working constructively with people of different viewpoints, and this quality also should prove of no small value in Geneva.

By adding men like Al Lowenstein and Andrew Young to the counsels of foreign policy, the new administration deepens our confidence in both the direction and tone of our international effort. The same may be said of the Vice President's recent trip and the enlistment of his perspective in foreign policy deliberations.

I hope very much that these men will be included not only in policy administration, but also in its formulation. That will help us combine the realism and sophistication necessary in foreign affairs with the initiative and moral force which will best serve our real interests and those of the rest of mankind.

THE CASE AGAINST COMPREHENSIVE GUN CONTROL

HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most stalwart defenders of the right to own and use firearms by American citizens is my good friend and colleague, JOHN M. ASHBROOK. He has written an article entitled "Against Comprehensive Gun Control" which appears in the July/August 1976, issue of *Current History*. Arguing the other side of the issue is Senator KENNEDY.

At this point I include the text of Mr. ASHBROOK's article in the *RECORD* and commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

AGAINST COMPREHENSIVE GUN CONTROL

(By John M. Ashbrook)

"Most Americans believe that laws that prohibit concealed weapons are fair. . . . This is not what the advocates of gun control legislation mean. . . . They advocate the registration and the eventual confiscation of firearms."

Every few years there is a renewed call for legislation dealing with firearms. Often the proposed legislation would further restrict the right of law-abiding American citizens to own and use firearms. Such legislation is usually proposed in the hope that it will help put an end to violent crime; so-called gun control is viewed as crime control. But it is a serious mistake to confuse the two.

Let us define the terms. The sloganers throw the words "gun control" around as if everybody knows what they mean—as if good citizens are for gun control and bad citizens are against it. In fact, every American I know is for some form of gun control. No one favors allowing people to walk the streets with Thompson submachine guns. Nor does the average citizen need a howitzer or an anti-tank bazooka. Most Americans believe that laws that prohibit concealed weapons are fair. The list could go on and on. This is not what the advocates of gun control legislation mean, however. They advocate the registration and the eventual confiscation of firearms.

The right (and in some societies, the duty) of citizens to own arms is of long standing. As early as the thirteenth century, the English Parliament upheld the right of Englishmen to keep and bear arms.

In his *Commentaries*, an important basis for our founding fathers' understanding of English law, William Blackstone, the English jurist, pointed to the importance of the right to keep and bear arms, a right that is the final recourse of free men against tyranny.

This right, of course, played an important role in the American Revolution. In his book, *Our Vanishing Freedom*, James B. Whisker writes, "the first clash between Colonists and British forces came about as a result of Americans' defense of their right to keep and bear arms."¹ It was British General Thomas Gage's attempt to remove military supplies kept by the colonial militia that helped start the American Revolution.

The second amendment to the United States Constitution speaks of the right of the people to keep and bear arms. Constitutions of the original 13 states also recognized the right. During the nation's westward expansion, the right to own firearms was well recognized.²

In addition to the provisions of the U.S. constitution, constitutions of over 7 percent of the states recognize an individual's right to keep and bear arms.

Gun control is frequently advocated as a means of reducing crime. Certainly, almost every American would like to reduce the amount of criminal activity in this country. There is no reason to believe, however, that gun control will result in crime control.

There are already more than 20,000 gun laws in existence at the federal, state and local levels. Many of these laws have been enacted in the last few years in an effort to bring crime under control. Despite all these laws, the crime rate has continued to escalate.

In fact, proponents of gun control legislation cannot point to any city or state that has reduced crime by adopting a gun law, regardless of the many gun laws on the books. It is interesting to note that, according to Federal Bureau of Investigation crime reports, approximately 20 percent of all the murders in the United States take place in New York City, Chicago, Detroit and Washington, D.C. Each of these cities has very stringent firearms laws. Why has gun control failed in those cities?

Gun control advocates respond that either the laws are not strong enough or that weak laws in surrounding jurisdictions make it easy to get around the laws. But New York City, for example, has one of the strongest gun control laws in the nation. There is a virtual handgun prohibition; only some 500 handgun permits are issued to persons not involved in law enforcement. Nevertheless, in 1973, New York City had almost twice as many murders with handguns and more than four times as many robberies with handguns as the rest of the country, on a per capita basis.

Proponents of gun control blame Ohio and other states with minimal gun laws for the high crime rates in New York City and Detroit. They believe that the availability of firearms causes crime. If this were the case, a state like Ohio, with minimal firearms laws, would have a far higher crime rate than states where guns can be obtained only by illegal purchases. In actuality, however, Ohio has a far lower murder and robbery rate than either New York or Michigan.

The excuse that guns from areas with weak laws account for the failure of New York City's firearms laws collapses on other grounds. It should be kept in mind that it is a violation of federal law for a person to buy a handgun outside his state of residence or for a person to sell a gun to a non-resi-

Footnotes at end of article.

dent. In addition, it is a violation of state law for any New Yorker to import, carry or possess an unlicensed gun. Why will another federal law be obeyed when all the others have not?

The truth of the matter is that people who commit crimes like murder and robbery are not going to worry about a gun-licensing or registration law. Criminally minded individuals will always be able to procure guns—regardless of firearm laws. It is the law-abiding citizens who will lose their right to gun ownership. And it is the law-abiding citizens who are not going to commit murder and bank robbery anyway.

Charles Lee Howard, who has been serving time in the Ohio State Penitentiary, might well be called an expert on this subject. Howard has written:

It's baffling that the people who want to prevent criminals like me from getting hold of guns expect to accomplish this by passing new laws. Do they forget that the criminal makes a business of breaking laws? No criminal would obey a gun law while committing a crime of equal or greater seriousness.¹

The lesson of Charles Lee Howard should be clear to everyone. Any person willing to risk the penalties for murder, burglary or assault is not going to worry about the penalty for possessing an unauthorized weapon.

In short, it is naive to think that legislation to register or otherwise make it difficult to acquire firearms for legitimate purposes would in any way impede the unlawful conduct of the criminal or would prevent him from securing a gun. This position is backed by the California Peace Officers Association, which in 1969 stated:

We have been unable to discover any evidence which would indicate that there is any direct relationship between the registration of firearms or the licensing of gun owners and the reduction in crime committed by the use of firearms.²

It is also supported by the National Sheriffs' Association, which has said:

There is no valid evidence whatsoever to indicate that depriving law-abiding American citizens of the right to own arms would in any way lessen crime or criminal activity. . . . The National Sheriffs' Association unequivocally opposes any legislation that has as its intent the confiscation of firearms . . . or the taking away from law-abiding American citizens their right to purchase, own and keep arms.³

Other police officials have also made statements on the issue. The chief of police of Los Angeles, California, had the following to say on more firearm legislation:

My views on gun control and the rights of individual gun ownership are well known. Some people seem to believe that if you legislate against handguns you will reduce murders and other gun-related crimes. That whole idea is absurd. We have legal restrictions in guns right now, but that doesn't stop the Arthur Bremers from receiving \$50 fines or probation.

New York is a good example of a city that has restrictions on handgun ownership. The Sullivan Law has been in effect for several years. Yet, this law seems to only have an impact on the people who are generally law-abiding. The criminals sure don't have any difficulty getting guns.⁴

Chief James Rochford of the Chicago Police Department takes an opposite viewpoint. He favors not only the registration but the outright confiscation of firearms. However, the policemen beneath him differ drastically. A poll of Chicago policemen indicated that 73.5 percent believe that current gun laws are adequate; they do not favor extending gun control laws despite the position of their chief.

In the central portion of Ohio, I took a survey of law enforcement officers. There was overwhelming opposition to the federal registration or confiscation of all firearms.

When the question was federal registration of all handguns, there was still overwhelming opposition. By almost a three-to-one margin these officials felt that, if there were to be any more laws dealing with firearms, they should be at the state level rather than at the federal level.

These statements are supported in a comprehensive study prepared by Alan S. Krug, an economist at Pennsylvania State University. His study, which related FBI crime statistics to state firearms laws, concluded that "there is no statistically significant difference in crime rates between states that have firearms licensing laws and those that do not."⁵

Another myth is the theory that most handgun murders are unpremeditated, spontaneous crimes primarily resulting from family or romantic quarrels. Such killings are frequently labeled "crimes of passion."

A recent study in New York City conducted by the Rand Institute indicates that this is a myth. The study revealed that an upsurge in deliberate murders was responsible for most of the 60 percent increase in homicide in New York City from 1968 to 1974. During that period, homicides rose from 968 a year to 1,554.

The Rand study emphasized that in most murder cases there was no longer a close relationship between the victim and the killer. At most, one out of five involved family members or close friends. The report declared that "We find that the major part of the citywide rise in homicides since 1968 seems to be in deliberate killings."⁶

No one can doubt that crime is a growing industry in the United States. The number of crimes committed in the United States is growing astronomically; since 1960 the crime rate has more than doubled. From 1973 to 1974, there was the largest annual increase—17 percent—in serious crime in the history of our country. According to the latest FBI figures, serious crime increased another 9 percent in 1975. Serious crime includes murder, rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny and auto theft. It is estimated that if unreported crimes were included the total might be three to five times higher in a number of cities.

Terrorism continues to be a threat. We read of terrorist bombings in London and other cities overseas. While not receiving as much media attention, terrorist activities are also continuing in the United States. During 1975, there was an increase in bombings in this country. Sixty-nine people were killed, and 326 were injured. Property damage was over \$26 million.

Gun control is indeed needed to control criminals. I have introduced legislation that would make a prison sentence mandatory for anyone convicted of committing a crime in which he used a gun. To quote the chief of the Los Angeles Police Department:

If we really want to reduce gun-related crimes, all we have to do is require judges to impose an additional penalty on those individuals using guns during crimes. This has a dramatic deterrent effect on other gun-carrying criminals. Your average criminal on the street knows just what society will tolerate. He knows that his sentence will not be any greater, under current judicial practices, if he "picks a piece."⁷

Police officials do not confuse gun control with crime control. The American people have expressed similar views. Decision Making Information, a firm based in Santa Ana, California, recently completed a comprehensive public opinion survey on the issue of gun control.⁸ This poll, conducted during September and October, 1975, is based on interviews with more than 1,500 registered voters from all regions of the country.

According to the DMI survey, almost three out of every four Americans feel that crime would not be reduced if Congress forced the people to turn in their guns. Instead, they

recommend harsher punishment of criminals as the best way of cutting back on crime.

The survey found that fully 73 percent of the public do not believe that a federal law requiring all guns to be turned in would be effective in reducing crime. When asked to suggest ways to reduce crime, only 11 percent volunteered gun control as a solution. In contrast, by far the most popular suggestion was more severe punishment of criminals (33 percent). Only 1 percent mentioned the registration of firearms, and less than .5 percent suggested a ban on so-called "Saturday night specials."

In addition, 78 percent of the public feel that neither of the two recent attempts to assassinate President Gerald Ford could have been prevented by a national handgun registration law, and 71 percent reject the idea that assassination attempts on public officials could be avoided by banning the private ownership of handguns.

In conclusion, let us look at one of the causes of crime. In my opinion, a major problem is the decline of one of the basic tenets of this country—individual responsibility. Our forefathers believed that a person was responsible for his actions. If a person committed a crime, he should pay the price.

In recent years, some sociologists and other social scientists have advanced the view that individuals are not responsible for their actions. On the contrary, individuals are supposedly the products of their environment. The result has been the decline of individual responsibility and a rise in crime.

Nevertheless, attempts to ignore the facts of life have not negated those facts. Human beings are responsible for their actions. A return to this basic view will help to deter and punish criminals.

FOOTNOTES

¹ James B. Whisker, *Our Vanishing Freedom*, 2d ed. (Skokie, Ill.: Publishers' Development Corp., 1973).

² For a more detailed treatment of the historical and constitutional bases for the right to own firearms, see *ibid.*

³ Charles Lee Howard as quoted in John Lee Ashbrook, "Gun Control Legislation," *Congressional Record*, June 27, 1968, p.H 19144.

⁴ Lynn D. Compton, "California Police Officers Adopt Gun Control Policy," *Journal of California Law Enforcement* (January, 1969), p. 126.

⁵ National Sheriffs' Association, "Resolution," June 23, 1971.

⁶ As quoted in "Tough Words on Crime by L.A. Police Chief," *Human Events*, vol. 35, no. 12 (March 22, 1975), pp. 8-9.

⁷ Alan S. Krug, *A Statistical Study of the Relationship Between Fire Arms Licensing Laws and Crime Rates* (University Park: Institute for Research on Land and Water Resources, 1967). See also Douglas R. Murray, "Handguns, Gun Control Laws and Firearm Violence," *Social Reforms*, vol. 23, no. 11 (October, 1975), pp. 91-93.

⁸ Arthur J. Swerse and Elizabeth Enloe, *Homicide in Harlem* (Santa Monica: Rand Institute, 1975).

⁹ *Supra*, note 6.

¹⁰ "Public Opinion Survey on Gun Control" (Santa Ana: Decision Making Information, 1975).

A NEW START ON CYPRUS

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the new administration has decided to approach the problem of Cyprus, which

confounded its predecessor, with a new team and a new goal. The team is headed by Clark Clifford, a distinguished public servant who leaves next week for Greece, Turkey, and Cyprus. The new goal: To take advantage of the change in Washington by encouraging the principals to negotiate, something they have not been able to do for 30 months.

The Washington Post, in an excellent editorial, supports this mission and this goal, as I do. The dual hostilities—between Greece and Turkey, and between the executive branch and the Congress—can now be ended and the Clifford mission is the way to start.

The editorial follows:

NEW HOPE IN CYPRUS?

What is unique about the Cyprus crisis is the extent to which it is bound up with the diplomatic and political style of one man, Henry Kissinger. This is said not to initiate a round of recrimination, which nobody needs, but rather in the spirit of a remark made many years ago by Henry Stimson, when he was asked, "How on earth can we ever bring peace to the world?" He replied: "You begin by bringing to Washington a small handful of able men who believe that the achievement of peace is possible. You work them to the bone until they no longer believe that it is possible. And then you throw them out and bring in a new bunch who believe that it is possible." Leaving aside how applicable it may be to Mr. Kissinger's frame of mind when he left office, Mr. Stimson's prescription may well be relevant to any number of international disputes and conflicts now seemingly deadlocked. For today, it is enough to note that no sooner had a "new bunch" moved in than, suddenly, the prospects for some movement on Cyprus started looking up. A new American initiative has been launched, with the naming of a special emissary, Clark Clifford, to explore the opportunities for settlement. Almost overnight, the Greek Cypriot majority, huddled in the South, and the Turkish Cypriot minority, settled behind the Turkish occupying army in the North, have started recalculating their odds. So have their patrons in Greece and Turkey. The upshot is that a situation that looked virtually incurable and fraught with peril only a month ago has about it a cast of cautious hope today.

The key has always been in Ankara. As long as Turkey saw that the United States was tying the full resumption of U.S.-Turkish military cooperation to renewed American access to Turkish bases, rather than to progress on healing the Turkish-inflicted wound on Cyprus, then things only got worse. Congress, controlled by forces demanding a rollback of the Turkish occupation of Cyprus, defied Mr. Kissinger on arms and aid for Turkey. The Turks responded by closing bases used by the United States and by edging toward the NATO exit door. Efforts to promote talks on the island got nowhere.

But Mr. Carter said during the campaign, and Secretary of State Cyrus Vance has just restated, that progress on Cyprus must be made before questions of arms and aid can be addressed. Obviously with this in mind, Turkey on Jan. 27 allowed the leader of the Turkish Cypriot minority, Rauf Denktaş, to meet with the Greek Cypriot president, Archbishop Makarios. It was the first such meeting in 13 years, and another is planned on Feb. 12. Various compromise formulas are being discussed to allow the two communities to live side by side in peace under the same governmental roof. The Turkish political opposition is no doubt tempted, as usual, to denounce any display of moderation as a sellout. But there are signs, small but

promising, that the Turks realize that the wind from Washington has shifted and that this may be the time to cut the appalling losses in international prestige, in defense readiness and in access to the European economy that their Cyprus policy has inflicted upon them.

The Cyprus crisis is often perceived as the product of profound ethnic rivalries, which are also held accountable for the host of other problems that have rent Greek-Turkish relations and decimated the eastern Mediterranean corner of NATO in recent years. One does not want to dismiss the ethnic factor: Without it there would have been no crisis. But the proximate cause of the crisis was a flawed American policy, and its solution became hopelessly ensnared in executive-congressional combat. This makes it easier, not harder, to try to fix now. A sensible policy is not only likely to untangle Greeks and Turks but to dissolve the executive-congressional snarl. It is a time for quiet diplomacy and meaningful consultation with Congress. Unlike, let us say, the Arab-Israeli conflict, the Cyprus dispute, for all the bitterness that has compounded it in the past, may not be quite as intractable as it has sometimes been seen—or made—to be.

PUBLIC WORKS LEGISLATION: 10 SUGGESTED REFORMS

HON. WILLIAM J. HUGHES

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, on February 2, I had the privilege of appearing before Chairman ROBERT A. ROE's Public Works Subcommittee on Economic Development to make suggestions on how to improve the competition for and the delivery of public works funds. It is important that we make these improvements in light of the fact that the legislation, of which I am 1 of more than 200 cosponsors, calls for a \$4 billion commitment in public works funds—twice as much as were distributed last year.

Putting Americans back to work is the most important domestic problem we face. The public works bill will not by itself be the answer but it can provide a very important stimulus to rejuvenate our economy, particularly in the construction trades.

My recommendations on how to improve the effectiveness of the program was made after a very detailed inquiry into the regulations and selection process adopted by the U.S. Economic Development Administration in December 1976.

My principal recommendation is that a two-tier review system be established so that no longer will a computer select projects without any subjective review being considered in the process.

At this point, I insert the text of my statement in full for the consideration of those who, like me, hold great hope for this program and want to see it succeed:

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE WILLIAM J. HUGHES

Mr. Chairman, good afternoon. My name is William J. Hughes, a Member of Congress representing New Jersey's Second Congressional District. I have the privilege today of introducing three public officials from my area who share at least one thing in common.

They represent constituencies in Cumberland County, which despite the second highest unemployment rate in the State of New Jersey, failed to receive a nickel of Public Works funds. After reviewing the selection process established by the Economic Development Administration for the award of Local Public Works Capital Development and Investment Act funds, I believe I now have a better idea of how this happened. It is my intention today to make suggestions that will improve this program to insure that it does not happen again in areas of the nation such as Cumberland County which desperately need Federal assistance to put unemployed Americans back to work.

I know that the Chairman already knows the gentlemen at the table with me, but permit me to introduce to the other Members of the Subcommittee, Mayor Patrick Florilli of Vineland, and Freeholders Ed Salmon and Henry Ricci. Chairman ROE has personally gone out of his way to assist them and other public officials in my area in attempting to understand the objectives of the Subcommittee. Permit me again Chairman ROE, to thank you and your fine staff.

Bob ROE knows my District well. For the benefit of the others on the Subcommittee, let me generalize by saying it is the area of New Jersey most associated with our slogan: "Garden State."

In land area, the Second Congressional District comprises more than a quarter of the State's geography and an even greater percentage of its beaches, bays and scenic countryside.

Its two major industries are tourism and manufacturing and each is suffering from the consequences of a fuel shortage, the most severe winter in decades, and an unemployment rate that in many areas far exceeds the state and national averages.

Naturally, when my municipalities learned last year of the Local Public Works legislation contemplated by Congress, there was much interest and excitement generated at the prospect of receiving 100 percent Federal funds for long delayed Public Works construction.

No one, however, anticipated the volume of applications that would be submitted to the EDA for consideration. More than 1,000 projects seeking \$2 Billion in funds were ranked within our State in competition for what turned out to be slightly less than \$100 million allotted to New Jersey.

It seems likely that the disappointment of many communities could have been mitigated if it were not for the fact that the computerized ranking system developed by EDA seemed to many totally irrational. In fact, however, it might have been as rational as a computer can make it. And that's my main criticism of the program—there simply was no real subjective judgment as to the relative value and merits of competing projects. This, I believe, can be avoided in the next round of funding should this Committee adopt some recommendations I am making after having reviewed the selection process. I am also submitting with my testimony an analysis of where the funds were committed in New Jersey to support my contention that changes are needed in the legislation.

EDA officials advise me that the lack of any subjective judgment was primarily due to a lack of manpower and the time restraints under which they were working. I do not find the argument convincing. My inquiry determined that at a minimum they could have involved local economic development representatives in the decision-making process. They did not, choosing instead to permit selections to be made solely by computer. Accordingly, I would respectfully make the following recommendations to the Subcommittee:

1. Two-tier Review. There must be an opportunity to subjectively review projects

ranked by the computer so that a special effort can be made to pick those which will have a long-term, positive effect on continuing employment in the community or provide special services by meeting special community needs. Mayor Florilli, for example, was seeking funds for an extension of the stack of the City's utility generating station which not only would have had a positive effect on reducing unemployment in the construction trades, but result as well in a savings of \$150,000 a month to consumers through lower utility charges; Bridgeton officials made an excellent case for long-term benefits by extending their water system; and Mayor Salmon intends to address benefits of the proposals submitted by Millville and the county that went beyond the benefits of facility construction.

The problem, it seems to be, occurred when EDA made the policy decision to select only those projects which scored highest within geographic benchmark areas in a given state. This meant that in New Jersey, for example, 56 projects were selected with no value judgment as to their relative merit when stacked up against other that attained nearly identical rankings.

My suggestion is that the EDA subject the top 25 percent of the projects ranked within a state to subsequent review that would involve local EDA representatives and public officials. Had this been done in New Jersey, the EDA would have had the opportunity to review some 250 projects in the 70 percent funding category before narrowing the list down to an amount equal to the sum allotted to the State.

While I recognize that one of the main goals is to get people back to work and not bog the program down in endless paperwork, I believe that such a second tier review process could be completed within 60 days following the ranking by computer.

I would therefore further suggest that under the point system adopted by EDA that those dealing with long-term effects be deleted from the initial computer ranking process and reserved instead for the second stage review.

2. Eliminate 70/30 Funding. There seems to be universal agreement that the 70/30 split funding formula was a serious mistake. Its intention was good—to insure that areas with unemployment exceeding 6.5 percent, yet below the national average, receive some commitment of funds.

As we all know, what happened between the passage of the Local Public Works Capital Development and Investment Act and its implementation, the national rate of unemployment dropped significantly statistically. This compressed eligibility in the 30 percent category to a relatively small number of communities, some of which were relatively affluent. In New Jersey, the practical application was that communities with extremely high rates and numbers of unemployed could only apply for the 70 percent funding pool and had a one in eleven chance of success. Those communities whose unemployment rate was between 6.5 percent and the then national average of 7.37 percent had one chance in five of funding under the 30 percent category.

In my District, this resulted in an unfortunate and incredibly unfair situation in which not a single project was funded in Salem County. The county's unemployment rate according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics was set at 7.91 percent. This made the county and the townships and municipalities therein too far down the list to compete for funds in the 70 percent category. Yet the rate was just over the national average to prevent competition for 30 percent funding. A review of projects funded in the latter category reveal that each and every one had an unemployment rate less than that ex-

perienced in Salem County. This, Mr. Chairman, simply cannot be tolerated in this new round of funding. My suggestion is that the split funding be eliminated entirely.

3. Local Commitment. In my opinion, Mr. Chairman, some communities were "wish-tricking" through the submission of projects that never would have been submitted had a local commitment even as low as 10 percent been required. I think the communities should demonstrate local support by agreeing to put up a minimum of 10 percent of the money.

4. Benchmarks. EDA officials attempted to give geographical allocations by establishing benchmark figures for labor market areas within the state. They were quick to point out that this was not an entitlement but a system devised for spreading the money out. And this is where Cumberland County lost out. Though it had a benchmark of 1.5 percent of the state unemployed, it did not receive the minimum \$1.5 million it would have received had that benchmark been an entitlement. This is because the EDA decided to move from one benchmark area to another as benchmark allocations were exceeded. It would seem a rather simple and fair thing to do to require that funds be allocated in a fashion so as not to exceed the benchmark for a given labor market area. Had that been followed, we would have at least seen some funds allocated to Cumberland County, Salem County, Middlesex County and other areas overlooked. In this regard, I strongly recommend that in the new round of funding we begin where we left off. That is to say, we begin allocating the new money set aside for New Jersey to benchmark areas left out last time.

5. Statistics. My area of southern New Jersey like other areas of the country relies heavily on a seasonal economy. Millions of visitors come to our beaches each year. Thousands of jobs are created. Yet with the Fall and Winter, we see pockets of unemployment approaching a quarter to a third of the available work force.

Areas which depend on a seasonal economy should be permitted to take the highest three-month unemployment period (consecutive) rather than necessarily the most recent three months following authorization of the legislation. I realize that we must have some time constraints and suggest that the three months be drawn from seasonally adjusted figures. These are readily available in the State of New Jersey.

6. Priority Ranking. A number of communities in my District and throughout the State submitted more than one application. Using the computer system, we face the real possibility that since they come from the same geographical area and will likely accrue the same or similar ranking, that a project of considerably less priority within the community could be funded. It is my suggestion, therefore, that officials be asked to rank their proposals by priority which will be of most benefit should a review system as I suggested earlier be adopted.

7. Local Workers. One of our objectives is to stimulate employment within the project area. I think this objective could be achieved by requiring on the application a statement that no less than 25 percent of the workers would be hired from the project area. If this were to create special problems that might inordinately delay the processing of applications, I would suggest a modification in which extra points are awarded to applicants which indicate that 25 percent or more of the workers would be hired from the project area. While this is not standard practice in awarding of federal contracts, this is not a standard program. The point of this legislation is to put people to work, within areas of high unemployment. Such a requirement would put local construction workers in con-

tact with representatives of local governments seeking project funds.

8. Minimum Unemployment. There has been considerable criticism generated from the first round of Local Public Works financing because several very affluent areas succeeded in obtaining Public Works funds. This was only partially due to the 30 percent funding category from which they benefited. Another problem was that local areas were permitted to submit not their own rate of unemployment but that of a given labor market area. In some cases these embraced communities with very high unemployment rates. This could be corrected, in my opinion, by requiring that the applicant have within its own geographical boundary an unemployment rate of at least 6.5 percent.

9. Waivers. Several very good projects were denied waivers in New Jersey because they exceeded a \$5 million cap mandated by the EDA. I recognize that when you are dealing with \$100 million for the entire state, a project in excess of \$5 million could severely deplete the funds and work adversely against geographical distribution. However, some of these larger projects had the potential for generating considerable numbers of jobs and leaving behind facilities of long-term benefit. I know of several within my Congressional District. I would suggest that there be no cap put on the amount of funds being requested for any one project so that it might be scored with all of the other submissions. Should it make the list of the top 25 percent, as I suggested earlier, it could then be reviewed subjectively with the other proposed projects. At that time, grounds for rejection could certainly be that to award the funds for the project would unfairly deprive other areas of Public Works funds.

10. Resubmission. As I am sure you have heard, some applicant communities were outraged when poor mail service exacerbated by a strike of United Parcel Service prevented their timely resubmission of projects returned on minor technical grounds. In some cases, applicants were asked to resubmit the proposal by a deadline date that preceded the arrival of their resubmission notification. Again, Mr. Chairman, if we have a two-tier review process which would include a minimum of one week to resubmit applications, these situations could be eliminated.

To conclude and summarize, it is my belief that we should take just an extra bit of time to introduce some subjective analysis of projects in this second round of Public Works funding. Construction is due to begin soon on projects selected in the first round. That stimulus will be felt in the next few weeks and months. Meanwhile we can improve upon and contemplate this effort through improvements to H.R. 11.

Let us commit, Mr. Chairman, to a goal of not only putting Americans back to work in useful and needed Public Works projects, but select the choicest of them to fund. Immediate benefits will then become long-term benefits as well and be remembered as a positive contribution to the needs of local communities for years to come.

Thank you for permitting me to testify before your Subcommittee.

SOVIET TREATMENT OF AMERICAN TOURISTS

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I recently met with Louis Berlin, a young Ameri-

can who had just returned from the Soviet Union. Mr. Berlin traveled with a letter of introduction from myself to the American Ambassador in Moscow. This letter and others were confiscated by Soviet authorities who warned Mr. Berlin not to notify the Embassy of the incident, in violation of the Consular Convention and Protocol, article 12, sections 2 and 3.

The following is a detailed account of the improper treatment of Louis Berlin by Soviet authorities. I suggest to my colleagues that the action taken against Mr. Berlin, and other cases like this during recent months, reflect the current Soviet attitude toward American tourists:

SOVIET TREATMENT OF AMERICAN TOURISTS

(By Louis H. Berlin)

On January 4, 1977, I arrived at the Moscow airport for the purpose of tourism. My bags were searched by customs officials, and several books relating to Jewish history and culture were removed. I was taken to a room off the main lobby, the door was locked, and I was ordered to empty my pockets. I stated that I refused to be searched without a warrant, demanded that an Embassy official be present if a search was to be conducted, and insisted that the Embassy be notified of my detention at once. My statements were ignored, and I was again ordered to empty my pockets. I refused, and the police were called in. The police, numbering at least three, grabbed my arm and roughly twisted it behind my back in an uncomfortable but not painful manner. At no time during this process did I offer any physical resistance. As I was held in this position, my clothing was gone through, and my coat, jacket, sweater, shoes, socks, and boots were searched thoroughly and removed. My pockets were emptied, and I was brusquely and thoroughly frisked.

The police left and the custom officials meticulously went through the contents of my pockets, examining everything, especially papers and personal notes, in detail. I was ordered to write a statement explaining where I had obtained the books and papers I had brought with me. My protests about the illegality of the whole procedure were useless, so I complied in an effort to speed up the process. My statement was translated, and I was ordered to sign it and write down my parents' names and places of employment. I was also ordered to sign what appeared to be a receipt for books, personal papers, and personal notes that were to be confiscated, as well as a form filled out entirely in Russian. I protested that I knew no Russian, and since no translation was proffered, and since they were insistent on having my signature, I signed.

Confiscated were several books, personal papers, and a letter of introduction from my Congressman, Mr. Lehman, to the American Ambassador in Moscow. None of the materials were anti-Soviet in nature. Indeed, nothing referred to the Soviet Union at all. All materials were confiscated in violation of the Helsinki agreement and Russian law, and in a manner contrary to the Helsinki agreement and consular agreement. Requests for copies of the documents I signed were ignored. I was warned not to notify the Embassy of the incident, and cautioned not to engage in anti-Soviet behavior. I was then taken to my hotel. Elapsed time was four hours.

On January 11, I arrived at Leningrad airport, where I experienced no difficulty going through passport and customs control. While waiting for boarding in a lounge, I was summoned by an Intourist official to return with him to an office upstairs. My hand luggage and coat were searched thor-

oughly, and I was asked to empty my pockets. Deciding that it would be easier if I did, I complied. I was then searched for further materials, and my papers were examined closely, as were all my personal belongings. I was asked questions which were designed to implicate myself in illegal activities. I was warned against bringing in materials on future visits, and an attempt was made to frighten me from encouraging other persons to do the same. I was then taken to board the airplane.

At no time during my visit did I do anything illegal. I made no anti-Soviet statements, nor possessed anti-Soviet documents. I did visit with Soviet Jews who have been denied exit visas in violation of the Helsinki agreement. My treatment by Soviet authorities was illegal and in violation of the Helsinki agreement. The Soviet government has by its actions indicated that it intends to violate the law and the Helsinki agreement. I believe that a directive should be issued requiring American consular officials to be present at the arrival and departure of all vehicles carrying American citizens across Soviet borders until the Soviet government changes its behavior.

ATMOSPHERIC RESEARCH AND GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, the last few months and particularly in the last few days I have tried, with unexpected and dramatic help from the weather, to direct attention to the need for coordinated, long-range climate research and environmental monitoring. The Subcommittee on the Environment and the Atmosphere, which I chair, focused last Congress on these matters, particularly national efforts concerned with inadvertent modification of the upper atmosphere, the costs and effects of exposure to low-level pollutants in the environment, and research related to sulfates in the atmosphere.

Two important observations have become manifest. First, present national efforts to monitor pollutants in the environment are fragmented and narrow in scope. Second, the most effective monitoring has been that of the atmosphere.

Looking ahead, the Environment and Atmosphere Subcommittee will work early this spring on the National Climate Program Act of 1977, H.R. 783, for which we are now seeking additional cosponsors. In conjunction with the development of this climate research bill, or soon thereafter, I hope we can focus hard on present capabilities for global environmental monitoring, perhaps beginning with the atmospheric aspects of major global cycles—of the element carbon, for example, or sulfur or nitrogen.

Four recent articles, which I ask to be inserted here in the RECORD, detail the present state of international monitoring efforts. They highlight both hopeful signs and serious problems, and provide a very appropriate backdrop for delib-

eration on climate research and useful, cost-effective environmental monitoring networks. The articles follow:

[From the San Bernardino Sun, October 13, 1976]

WORLDWIDE SCIENCE GROUP URGES GLOBAL MONITORING

(By Walter Sullivan)

WASHINGTON.—During the next two centuries increasing industrial activity is expected to raise the carbon dioxide content of the atmosphere at least fourfold and possibly eightfold, according to a report presented Tuesday to the International Council of Scientific Unions.

Since this could bring about major climate changes it was termed "rather alarming" in the report, prepared by the council's Scientific Committee on Problems of the Environment (SCOPE).

The council, representing all the specialized scientific unions, is holding its general assembly at the National Academy of Sciences here.

The report, entitled Environmental Issues 1976, notes that little has been done to implement the proposal for a Global Environmental Monitoring System (GEMS). The latter was endorsed by the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment, held in Stockholm in 1972.

While analyzing the probable reasons for this failure the report also examines possible long-term threats to the environment from human production of phosphorus, sulfur, mercury, and nitrogen compounds. It recommends, as well, as a wide range of programs to reveal which threats are real.

"It is difficult to see how best to improve the environment," says the report, "without first establishing fundamental facts; such facts will also serve to offset the interminable speculation passing for knowledge."

With regard to global monitoring it says: "Some of the proposed schemes are ambitious, idealistic, and very comprehensive." The hope repeatedly expressed at the Stockholm conference was that there be an international watch of the earth on the land, air and water to spot ominous changes.

The proposals include monitoring select species of plants and animals sensitive to subtle changes in the environment, much as miners once carried canaries to warn them when odorless "fire damp" (chiefly methane gas) appeared.

The delay in implementation, says the report, may be linked to "deficiencies in our basic understanding of how to go about monitoring and hence how to build a comprehensive global monitoring system." A number of the report recommendations are designed to correct such deficiencies.

The 296-page report was prepared under Prof. Victor A. Kovda, a specialist in child development at the University of Moscow, as the president of SCOPE, and his successor Prof. Gilbert F. White, director of the Institute of Behavioral Science at the University of Colorado in Boulder.

Both men spoke at Tuesday's meeting as did SCOPE members from five other countries.

Monitoring needs are listed in four categories:

1. Measuring levels of potentially harmful or beneficial substances not only in air, land and water but in living organisms "including man and his food."

2. Measuring such variables (or possible variables) as solar output, air transparency and soil chemistry.

3. Recording the extent of beneficial and harmful effects on life of the factors listed in the first two categories as well as effects of such factors as crowding, disease and genetic variations.

4. Keeping inventory of such indices of climate change as ice cap area, glacier size

and sea level, as well as effects of deforestation, agriculture, urbanization and energy use.

The most effective monitoring has been that of the atmosphere and this, the report says, has clearly shown the rise in carbon dioxide due to fuel burning. Carbon dioxide, it is feared, can act like the glass in a greenhouse, heating up the climate. Much, however, remains to be learned as to the extent to which oceans and the biosphere—all living organisms—absorb the added carbon dioxide. Such research is described as "a matter of urgency."

So rapid has been the increase in carbon dioxide production that in the decade ending in 1969, according to the report, the rise amounted to 50 per cent of the entire increase since the industrial revolution.

A special challenge, says the report, is to identify those threats to the environment that, once they become obvious, have reached an irreversible stage. An example cited is the fear that fluorocarbons, widely marketed as Freons, will deplete the protective ozone of the stratosphere.

"Management actions" were initiated, it says, "based on models predicting the consequences of specific levels of emission, rather than waiting until such consequences were detected." Freons are used both as refrigerants and as propellants in some spray cans. A ban on their use for the latter purpose now seems likely.

"It is interesting to point out here," the report continues, "that this ability to respond arose from an existing, long series of environmental studies into the atmospheric transport of radioactivity, carbon dioxide and particulates, and into the effects of supersonic aircraft on the stratosphere."

While some fear that human activity may be altering the climate in "irreversible and possibly harmful ways," this, says the report, is "difficult to refute or accept without a deeper understanding of the nature of climate. What are the causes of climate fluctuations? Are future climates predictable, and if so, in what sense?"

With regard to introduction into the environment of added nitrogen compounds, phosphorus and sulfur, the report says inventories are needed—particularly in soils—to allow future determination of trends.

[From Interdependent, December 1976]

IS EARTHWATCH WATCHING ANYTHING?

(By Elizabeth Sullivan)

Four years after the widely praised UN Environment Conference in Stockholm, the special program it created to look after the world's environmental health and the global monitoring system it was supposed to set up both could use a lot of help.

The program, UNEP (UN Environment Program), and the system, Earthwatch, are both threatened by a combination of global indifference, institutional indecision and political pressure linked to the omnipresent North-South dialogue.

Earthwatch presently has four components: the Global Environmental Monitoring System (GEMS), its central monitoring, research and evaluation network which is still fragmented and ill-defined; the International Referral Service (IRS), an international directory of environmental reference sources which, though operating, has drawn little response from the developing nations expected to use it; the International Registry of Potentially Toxic Chemicals (IRPTC); and an "Outer Limits" program designed to find out just how much pollution this planet can stand.

Though national self-interest has hampered Earthwatch's progress, UNEP officials feel they've finally come up with an acceptable and workable solution that will satisfy everyone, according to Jean-Claude Faby of UNEP's New York liaison office. For the devel-

oping countries, who want to keep the focus on local problems, UNEP will conduct tropical forest and soil quality analysis while meeting the rich countries' interest in overall global health by monitoring chemical pollutants and keeping an eye on the oceans.

But whether these moves will really help is open to doubt and some environmental experts argue that lack of support, particularly from the U.S., may have already doomed UNEP.

But others place the blame squarely on UNEP itself. "UNEP has never really developed a comprehensive strategy," asserts Walter Telesetsky of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) and a member of the UN delegation to UNEP's last Governing Council meeting this March and April. "There has been no major, concerted effort, so far as I know, to develop and define short term and long range goals for GEMS programs, or to develop a plan with explicit priority areas."

Scientists also argue that Earthwatch, responding to the political tug-of-war between developed and developing countries, has generally ignored objective scientific knowhow in establishing its priorities. A recent report by an international group of scientists discussing GEMS' failure noted that a great deal of relevant data is still untapped and the US National Academy of Sciences (NAS) in a recently published "Early Action" plan for GEMS urged that it start with "what is most scientifically advanced—air pollution," as NAS' Melinda Cain put it. She also termed the already existing IRS "fairly useless" because the sources aren't evaluated but said that, "Governments think it's great. It's something they can point at and say 'Look what we've done.'"

Though the need for international environmental cooperation is widely acknowledged, Earthwatch has already been damaged as everyone follows their own national line. Meanwhile, all the environmental problems discussed at Stockholm are still around and unless UNEP gets into gear soon, the industrialized world may push ahead on its own to solve them, and leave the developing countries to fend for themselves.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Dec. 19, 1976]

DÉTENTE THRIVING IN ENVIRONMENTAL AREA:
PROGRAM BEING EXPANDED TO COVER 40
U.S.-SOVIET PROJECTS

(By Peter J. Bernstein)

WASHINGTON.—Détente between the United States and the Soviet Union is flourishing in at least one area of mutual interest—environmental protection.

From Maine to Minsk, environmental exchanges are on the rise. Now entering its fifth year, the bilateral program of monitoring and research is being expanded to cover 40 projects involving hundreds of U.S. and Soviet scientists.

"This is a much bigger undertaking than many people seem to realize," said William A. Brown, executive secretary of the U.S.-U.S.S.R. Joint Environmental Committee.

Interviewed in his office at the Environmental Protection Agency, Brown, who coordinates the U.S. role in the program, said that this year alone there were more than 100 meetings of U.S. and Soviet scientists on projects covering air and water pollution control, farm pesticides, urban enhancement, wildlife and nature preserves, ocean dumping, biological and genetic changes, climate modification, earthquake prediction and legal aspects of environmental protection.

"In general, the Soviets have gotten more out of the bilateral program than we," Brown, a Foreign Service officer on loan to the environmental agency, said. "But we stand to benefit in the long run to the extent that our pollution control technology enables the Russians to reduce their impact on the global environment."

U.S. firms have jumped at the chance to sell environmental equipment to the Russians. Last February, at a clean-air exhibit in Moscow, the Russians bought every U.S. air pollution monitoring device. A second environmental exhibit—this time of water pollution monitoring equipment—is planned for March. "We expect comparable results," Brown said.

Earthquake prediction is considered the exchange program of greatest importance to U.S. scientists. Using computer models devised in the Soviet Union, U.S. seismologists two years ago successfully predicted small earthquakes for the first time in New York and Southern California.

Currently, U.S. seismologists looking for new earthquake clues are monitoring construction of the world's largest hydroelectric dam at Tadzhikistan in Soviet Asia. Excavation for the Nurek dam and reservoir, which required mammoth earthmoving operations, caused some seismic effects, Brown said. The monitoring results, he added, could prove of "tremendous importance" in selecting future hydroelectric sites in other regions.

Wildlife protection and research have received considerable attention in the environmental exchange, beginning with the shipment of rare Alaska musk oxen to Siberia last year. The Russians will shortly be sending Siberian crane eggs to the United States in hopes they will hatch at a research station in Wisconsin. The cranes, long-legged black-and-white birds that stand five feet tall, are regarded by many naturalists as among the most beautiful in the world.

Soviet and U.S. officials meeting in Moscow last month signed a bilateral convention for the protection of migratory birds such as snow geese and swans which migrate every year from Siberia over the Arctic to California. The treaty, which is subject to Senate ratification, was signed by environmental agency Administrator Russell E. Train and Yuri A. Izrael, chief of the Hydrometeorological Service and head of the Soviet air and water pollution control program.

As in previous years, top officials from half a dozen U.S. agencies attended the meeting in Moscow. Because Congress had appropriated no money specifically for the bilateral environmental exchange, each agency has contributed to its cost. U.S. government expenses, including the cost of interpreters, run \$1.5 to \$2 million a year, Brown said. Additional funds are provided by universities and private industry.

U.S. environmental officials are hoping to control the growth of the bilateral program. But with the addition of four new projects at last month's meeting—Arctic mammal preservation, pollution control in steel plants, environmental education and migratory birds—that goal is proving elusive.

The Russians apparently mean business on matters concerning the environment. At a big Communist Party congress last month, Soviet Communist Party chief Leonid I. Brezhnev underscored the increased priority of environmental spending by announcing a five-year budget of some 66 billion rubles to be spent mostly on air and water pollution control, which still is substantially less than U.S. environmental outlays but reflects changes in Soviet priorities brought about at least in part by exchanges with the United States.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 25, 1977]

MASSIVE EFFORT TO IDENTIFY BIOLOGICAL
AREAS STARTS

(By Bayard Webster)

A program aimed at identifying and delineating the world's different kinds of biological areas ranging from Alaska's tundra to Africa's deserts has gotten underway in the United States and other countries.

According to a report in the current issue of the journal, *Science*, the program, sponsored by the United Nations, the United States and the Soviet Union, is the first stage of a three-part project that will select sites for environmental monitoring and research in the different types of areas and then will use the research data to implement ecologically sound land-use practices in those regions.

The biosphere reserves program, as it is generally known, as a collective international effort sponsored by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), the National Science Foundation and the U.S.-U.S.S.R. Environmental Agreement, a compact calling for cooperative environmental research by the two countries.

"Our main aim is to protect the different biological regions, to see that we don't lose the plant and animal life—and their genes—in them, and to use them for ecological research, education and recreation according to their value for each of these activities," said Dr. Jerry F. Franklin, author of the *Science* report and head of the United States Biospheres Reserve Program.

Dr. Franklin's report focuses on the major extensive ecologically homogeneous areas, known as biomes, that are under study. These include such biological regions as the desert-sagebrush areas of Arizona, Mexico and California; the Douglas fir, cedar and hemlock forests of the Northwest, the swamp and marshlands of the South, the tropical rain forests of the tropics and the taigas—the coniferous forests of North America and Asia.

At the present stage of the biosphere reserves program in the United States, two dozen different major biomes have been identified in which there are approximately 30 specific areas that have been or are being considered as protected biological preserves.

The program, though overlapping many areas that are now Federal wilderness preserves, refuges or parks, does not conflict with such designations, Dr. Franklin said, because the cooperation of Federal and state governments will be essential in implementing the program.

The principal environmental and ecological research will be done in the designated areas, once Federal and state approval of the proposed area designation and study programs is given. Such research will consist of scientific monitoring of land, vegetation, water and air for pollutants that are contaminating or could contaminate the area to the point where it would lose its value for whatever purpose it was originally dedicated.

There are already in the nation more than a dozen experimental ecological preserves under intensive scientific scrutiny. They are already considered as part of the biosphere reserves program. One of these is a 15,000-acre forest in the Western Cascade Range of Oregon.

This area, populated by fir and hemlock, is being studied for the effect of logging on the quality of water, the effect of pesticides on ecosystems and the causes for fluctuations in small animal populations.

A similar project is being conducted in New Hampshire at the Hubbard Brook Experimental Forest, where monitoring of stream water quality, precipitation, soil composition and the effect on a watershed of clear-cutting operations are being studied.

According to the National Science Foundation, which has made a study of experimental ecological reserves in the country, such areas also serve to perpetuate a large variety of plants and animals, maintaining gene pools of native species that could help develop new strains.

Existing strains of food, fiber and wood plants, the foundation points out, often come

under pressure from fast-evolving diseases and pests, from short- and long-term changes in weather and climate and from advancing urbanization.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF HON. JAMES L. OBERSTAR

HON. JAMES L. OBERSTAR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker. Today I submitted a statement to the Task Force on Financial Accountability of the House Commission on Administrative Review in which I presented my views on standards for financial disclosure by Members of Congress. As part of that statement, I included my own financial disclosure report.

I would like to submit the recommendations which I made to the task force to the House for consideration by all my colleagues.

I also include my financial statement:

STATEMENT OF HON. JAMES L. OBERSTAR

I urge the task force to devise uniform, unequivocal, and exacting standards for reporting the financial condition and interests of Members of Congress in order to inform the public about actual or potential conflicts of interest between a Member's financial holdings and his or her public position. Such reporting should be mandatory.

Public financial accountability is the key to public confidence in elected officials. Financial disclosure rules now in effect for Members of Congress do not provide the kind of information needed to determine whether a Member has a present or potential conflict of interest. The recommendations I am proposing, together with others this Task Force has suggested, will achieve that goal.

I believe that the rules must require public disclosure of net worth of Members of Congress and sources of income other than salary. Members should also release the following tax information: gross income, taxable income, federal and state income tax paid.

Furthermore, strict limits should be placed on the amount of outside income that a Member of Congress may earn. I would set that figure at \$5,000 rather than at a percentage of salary. That is an amount small enough to be earned responsibly in honoraria from speeches and published articles but not large enough to involve the Member in commitments which would detract from the performance of his or her official duties. I would further limit individual honoraria to \$500.

In the interest of simplicity, I would suggest that April 30 be set as the deadline for filing disclosure statements; that is two weeks after the deadline for filing income tax returns. Most of the data required for such returns would also be required for financial disclosure statements.

I believe the financial disclosure statements of both the Member and the Member's spouse should reflect the following information:

1. Income (including honoraria): sources and amounts aggregating more than \$100 from any individual source.

2. Income tax paid: both Federal and state.

3. Gifts: source and value of lodging, food, or entertainment, of \$250 or more from any one source. Sources and value of other gifts worth in excess of \$100 from any one source.

I would exempt the following from disclosure requirements:

- Gifts from relatives.
- Gifts valued less than \$25.00.
- Gifts of personal hospitality.
- Reimbursements: aggregating \$250 or more from any individual source.
- Holdings: the identity and value of any property held, directly or indirectly, in a trade or business or for investment purposes or the production of income, and which has a fair market value of at least \$1,000 as of the close of the preceding calendar year.
- Debts: the identity and value of each liability owed, directly or indirectly, which is in excess of \$1,000 as of the close of the preceding calendar year, excluding "pledges" to charitable or tax exempt organizations.
- Securities and Transactions: identity, value and date of any transaction, directly or indirectly, in securities or commodities futures during the preceding year which exceeds \$1,000 except for transactions donating such securities to charitable or tax-exempt organizations.
- Real Estate: the identity and value of any purchase or sale, directly or indirectly, of any real property or of any interest therein, during the preceding calendar year and which exceeds \$1,000 in value as of the date of such purchase or sale.

I support provisions for criminal and civil penalties for willful falsification of a financial disclosure statement. I also believe requirements for disclosure should apply to both Members of Congress and candidates for Congress.

I am submitting with this statement a copy of my own financial disclosure report which a Certified Public Accountant has reviewed and verified. I would recommend that the Task Force adopt this format for financial disclosure by Members of Congress.

Personal financial statement of James L. and Marilyn G. Oberstar and children

ASSETS	
Cash:	
Savings account.....	\$9,500
Checking account.....	500
Paid into House pension fund.....	6,693
Life insurance (estimated cash value)	1,600
Securities (20 shares Eastman Kodak—estimated market value) ..	1,400
Subtotal	19,693
Real estate and personal property—House, Bethesda, Md. (estimated current market value)	105,000
Household goods.....	5,000
Autos (estimated retail value):	
1974 Buick station wagon.....	3,925
1975 Buick Apollo 4-door.....	2,925
Subtotal	116,850
Total assets.....	136,543
LIABILITIES	
Home mortgage.....	36,000
Insurance premiums payable (including: life, health, auto, home)	2,570
Property taxes payable.....	2,022
Loans payable.....	12,700
Auto loan—wagon.....	1,450
Auto loan—Apollo.....	2,689
N.Y. Life Insurance Co.....	2,000
Metropolitan Life Insurance Co.....	3,561
Various consumer installment loans bills	3,000
Total liabilities.....	53,292
Net worth.....	83,251

¹ NOTE.—1966 original purchase price: \$53,000.

*Statement of income and taxes paid, 1975—
James L. and Marilyn G. Oberstar*

Gross income	\$45,179.90
Salary	39,072.08
Allowance for official office supply and district office expense	13,646.15
Honoraria:	
American Road Builders	750.00
Minnesota Banking Association	1,000.00
Colorado Right to Life Committee	250.00
Interest/dividends	380.91
Tax refund	80.76
Taxable income	26,807.01
Federal tax	6,328.28
State tax (Minnesota)	3,552.00
Total State and Federal taxes paid	9,880.28

¹ This is an allowance to Members of Congress for official office expenses. Under regulations in effect during the 94th Congress, the allowance is chargeable to new Members as "Income". Reforms adopted in 1976 change that procedure so that, in the future, such items will be paid against signed vouchers, and not treated or available as income to Members of Congress.

NOTE.—Statement of 1976 income and taxes will be released after it has been submitted to IRS.

INCOME TAX OVERPAYMENT PROTECTION FOR OLDER AMERICANS

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, Congress has passed special tax relief provisions intended to insure that certain segments of our society, especially our older Americans, do not bear an unfair portion of the tax burden.

Because many of those who could benefit most from these provisions are either unaware of them or unable to apply them to their own situation, a special checklist has been designed. This checklist covers everything from medical and insurance expenses and theft losses, to the simplified "tax credit for the elderly," and is designed to help our senior citizens to avoid overpayment of income taxes.

I would like to enter this checklist so that my constituents in the "Fabulous Fifth" Congressional District may fully avail themselves of the tax relief measures due them:

PROTECTING OLDER AMERICANS AGAINST OVERPAYMENT OF INCOME TAXES (A REVISED CHECKLIST OF ITEMIZED DEDUCTIONS FOR USE IN TAXABLE YEAR 1976).

MEDICAL AND DENTAL EXPENSES

Medical and dental expenses (unreimbursed by insurance or otherwise) are deductible to the extent that they exceed 3 percent of a taxpayer's adjusted gross income (line 15c, Form 1040).

INSURANCE PREMIUMS

One-half of medical, hospital or health insurance premiums are deductible (up to \$150) without regard to the 3 percent limitation for other medical expenses. The re-

mainder of these premiums can be deducted, but is subject to the 3 percent rule.

DRUGS AND MEDICINES

Included in medical expenses (subject to 3% rule) but only to extent exceeding 1% of adjusted gross income (line 15c, Form 1040).

OTHER MEDICAL EXPENSES

Other allowable medical and dental expenses (subject to 3% limitation):
Abdominal supports (prescribed by a doctor)

Acupuncture services
Ambulance hire
Anesthetist
Arch supports (prescribed by a doctor)
Artificial limbs and teeth
Back supports (prescribed by a doctor)
Braces
Capital expenditures for medical purposes (e.g., elevator for persons with a heart ailment)—deductible to the extent that the cost of the capital expenditure exceeds the increase in value to your home because of the capital expenditure. Taxpayer should have an independent appraisal made to reflect clearly the increase in value.
Cardiographs
Chiropodist
Chiropractor
Christian Science practitioner, authorized
Convalescent home (for medical treatment only)
Crutches
Dental services (e.g., cleaning, X-ray, filling teeth)
Dentures
Dermatologist
Eyeglasses
Food or beverages specially prescribed by a physician (for treatment of illness, and in addition to, not as substitute for, regular diet; physician's statement needed)
Gynecologist
Hearing aids and batteries
Home health services
Hospital expenses
Insulin treatment
Invalid chair
Lab tests
Lipreading lessons (designed to overcome a handicap)
Neurologist
Nursing services (for medical care, including nurse's board paid by you)
Occupational therapist
Ophthalmologist
Optician
Optometrist
Oral surgery
Osteopath, licensed
Pediatrician
Physical examinations
Physical therapist
Physician
Podiatrist
Psychiatrist
Psychoanalyst
Psychologist
Psychotherapy
Radium therapy
Sacrolliac belt (prescribed by a doctor)
Seeing-eye dog and maintenance
Speech therapist
Splints
Supplementary medical insurance (Part B) under Medicare
Surgeon
Telephone/teletype special communications equipment for the deaf
Transportation expenses for medical purposes (7¢ per mile plus parking and tolls or actual fares for taxi, buses, etc.)
Vaccines
Vitamins prescribed by a doctor (but not taken as a food supplement or to preserve general health)
Wheelchairs
Whirlpool baths for medical purposes
X-rays

TAXES

Real estate
State and local gasoline
General sales
State and local income
Personal property

If sales tax tables are used in arriving at your deduction, you may add to the amount shown in the tax tables only the sales tax paid on the purchase of five classes of items: automobiles, airplanes, boats, mobile homes, and materials used to build a new home when you are your own contractor.

When using the sales tax tables, add to your adjusted gross income any nontaxable income (e.g., Social Security, Veterans' pensions or compensation payments, Railroad Retirement annuities, workmen's compensation, untaxed portion of long-term capital gains, recovery of pension costs, dividends untaxed under the dividend exclusion, interest on municipal bonds, unemployment compensation and public assistance payments).

CONTRIBUTIONS

In general, contributions may be deducted up to 50 percent of your adjusted gross income (line 15c, Form 1040). However, contributions to certain nonprofit foundations, veterans organizations, or fraternal societies are limited to 20% of adjusted gross income.

Cash contributions to qualified organizations for (1) religious, charitable, scientific, literary or educational purposes, (2) prevention of cruelty to children or animals, or (3) Federal, State or local governmental units (tuition for children attending parochial schools is not deductible). Fair market value of property (e.g., clothing, books, equipment, furniture) for charitable purposes. (For gifts of appreciated property, special rules apply. Contact local IRS office.)

Travel expenses (actual or 7¢ per mile plus parking and tolls) for charitable purposes (may not deduct insurance or depreciation in either case).

Cost and upkeep of uniforms used in charitable activities (e.g., scoutmaster).

Purchase of goods or tickets from charitable organizations (excess of amount paid over the fair market value of the goods or services).

Out-of-pocket expenses (e.g., postage, stationery, phone calls) while rendering services for charitable organizations.

Care of unrelated student in taxpayer's home under a written agreement with a qualifying organization (deduction is limited to \$50 per month).

INTEREST

Home mortgage.

Auto loan.

Installment purchases (television, washer, dryer, etc.).

Bank credit card—can deduct the finance charge as interest if no part is for service charges, loan fees, credit investigation fees, or similar charges.

Points—deductible as interest by buyer where financing agreement provides that they are to be paid for use of lender's money. Not deductible if points represent charges for services rendered by the lending institution (e.g., VA loan points are service charges and are not deductible as interest). Not deductible if paid by seller (are treated as selling expenses and represent a reduction of amount realized).

Penalty for prepayment of a mortgage—deductible as interest.

Revolving charge accounts—may deduct the "finance charge" if the charges are based on your unpaid balance and computed monthly.

Other charge accounts for installment purchases—may deduct the lesser of (1) 6% of the average monthly balance (average monthly balance equals the total of the unpaid balances for all 12 months, divided by

12) or (2) the portion of the total fee or service charge allocable to the year.

CASUALTY OR THEFT LOSSES

Casualty (e.g., tornado, flood, storm, fire, or auto accident provided not caused by a willful act or willful negligence) or theft losses to nonbusiness property—the amount of your casualty loss deduction is generally the lesser of (1) the decrease in fair market value of the property as a result of the casualty, or (2) your adjusted basis in the property. This amount must be further reduced by any insurance or other recovery, and, in the case of property held for personal use, by the \$100 limitation. You may use Form 4684 for computing your personal casualty loss.

CREDIT FOR CHILD AND DEPENDENT CARE EXPENSES

Certain payments made for child and dependent care may now be claimed as a credit against tax instead of as an itemized deduction.

If a taxpayer maintained a household that included a child under age 15 or a dependent or spouse incapable of self-care, a taxpayer may be allowed a 20% credit for employment related expenses. These expenses must have been paid during the taxable year in order to enable the taxpayer to work either full or part time.

For detailed information, see the instructions for Form 2441 on page 17.

MISCELLANEOUS

Alimony and separate maintenance (periodic payments).

Appraisal fees for casualty loss or to determine the fair market value of charitable contributions.

Union dues.

Cost of preparation of income tax return.

Cost of tools for employee (depreciated over the useful life of the tools).

Dues for Chamber of Commerce (if as a business expense).

Rental cost of a safe-deposit box for income-producing property.

Fees paid to investment counselors.

Subscriptions to business publications.

Telephone and postage in connection with investments.

Uniforms required for employment and not generally wearable off the job.

Maintenance of uniforms required for employment.

Special safety apparel (e.g., steel toe safety shoes or helmets worn by construction workers; special masks worn by welders).

Business entertainment expenses.

Business gift expenses not exceeding \$25 per recipient.

Employment agency fees under certain circumstances.

Cost of a periodic physical examination if required by employer.

Cost of installation and maintenance of a telephone required by the taxpayer's employment (deduction based on business use).

Cost of bond if required for employment.

Expenses of an office in your home if employment requires it.

Payments made by a teacher to a substitute.

Educational expense required by your employer to maintain your position or for maintaining or sharpening your skills for your employment.

Political Campaign Contributions.—Taxpayers may now claim either a deduction (line 32, Schedule A, Form 1040) or a credit (line 52, Form 1040), for campaign contributions to an individual who is a candidate for nomination or election to any Federal, State, or local office in any primary, general or special election. The deduction or credit is also applicable for any (1) committee supporting a candidate for Federal, State, or local elective public office, (2) national committee of a national political party, (3) State

committee of a national political party, or (4) local committee of a national political party. The maximum deduction is \$100 (\$200 for couples filing jointly). The amount of the tax credit is one-half of the political contribution, with a \$25 ceiling (\$50 for couples filing jointly).

Presidential Election Campaign Fund.—Additionally, taxpayers may voluntarily earmark \$1 of their taxes (\$2 on joint returns) for the Presidential Election Campaign Fund.

For any questions concerning any of these items, contact your local IRS office. You may also obtain helpful publications and additional forms by contacting your local IRS office.

OTHER TAX RELIEF MEASURES

Filing status	Required to file a tax return if gross income is at least—
Single (under age 65)-----	\$2,450
Single (age 65 or older)-----	3,200
Qualifying widow(er) under 65 with dependent child-----	2,850
Qualifying widow(er) 65 or older with dependent child-----	3,600
Married couple (both spouses under 65) filing jointly-----	3,600
Married couple (1 spouse 65 or older) filing jointly-----	4,350
Married couple (both spouses 65 or older) filing jointly-----	5,100
Married filing separately-----	750

Additional Personal Exemption for Age.—Besides the regular \$750 exemption allowed a taxpayer, a husband and wife who are 65 or older on the last day of the taxable year are each entitled to an additional exemption of \$750 because of age. You are considered 65 on the day before your 65th birthday. Thus, if your 65th birthday is on January 1, 1977, you will be entitled to the additional \$750 personal exemption because of age for your 1976 Federal income tax return.

General Tax Credit.—A new general tax credit is available. For this credit, the taxpayer may claim the greater of (1) \$35 per exemption shown on line 6d, Form 1040A or Form 1040, or (2) 2 percent of taxable income (line 15, Form 1040A or line 47, Form 1040) but not more than \$180 (\$90, if married, filing separately).

Multiple Support Agreements.—In general, a person may be claimed as a dependent of another taxpayer, provided five tests are met: (1) Support, (2) gross income, (3) member of household or relationship, (4) citizenship, and (5) separate return. But in some cases, two or more individuals provide support for an individual, and no one has contributed more than half the person's support. However, it still may be possible for one of the individuals to be entitled to a \$750 dependency deduction if the following requirements are met for multiple support:

1. Two or more persons—any one of whom could claim the person as a dependent if it were not for the support test—together contribute more than half of the dependent's support.

2. Any one of those who individually contribute more than 10% of the mutual dependent's support, but only one of them, may claim the dependency deduction.

3. Each of the others must file a written statement that he will not claim the dependency deduction for that year. The statement must be filed with the income tax return of the person who claims the dependency deduction. Form 2120 (Multiple Support Declaration) may be used for this purpose.

Sale of Personal Residence by Elderly Taxpayers.—A taxpayer may elect to exclude from gross income part or, under certain circumstances, all of the gain from the sale of his personal residence, provided:

1. He was 65 or older before the date of the sale, and

2. He owned and occupied the property as his personal residence for a period totaling at least 5 years within the 8-year period ending on the date of the sale.

Taxpayers meeting these two requirements may elect to exclude the entire gain from gross income if the adjusted sales price of their residence is \$20,000 (this amount will increase to \$35,000 for taxable years beginning after December 31, 1976) or less. (This election can only be made once during a taxpayer's lifetime.) If the adjusted sales price exceeds \$20,000 (this amount will increase to \$35,000 for taxable years beginning after December 31, 1976), an election may be made to exclude part of the gain based on a ratio of \$20,000 (this amount will increase to \$35,000 for taxable years beginning after December 31, 1976) over the adjusted sales price of the residence. Form 2119 (Sale or Exchange of Personal Residence) is helpful in determining what gain, if any, may be excluded by an elderly taxpayer when he sells his home.

Additionally, a taxpayer may elect to defer reporting the gain on the sale of his personal residence if within 18 months before or 18 months after the sale he buys and occupies another residence, the cost of which equals or exceeds the adjusted sales price of the old residence. Additional time is allowed if (1) you construct the new residence or (2) you were on active duty in the U.S. Armed Forces. Publication 523 (Tax Information on Selling Your Home) may also be helpful.

Credit for the Elderly.—A new, expanded, and simplified credit for the elderly has replaced the former more complex retirement income credit.

A taxpayer may be able to claim this credit and reduce taxes by as much as \$375 (if single), or \$622.50 (if married filing jointly), if the taxpayer is:

- (1) Age 65 or older, or
- (2) Under age 65 and retired under a public retirement system.

To be eligible for this credit, taxpayers no longer have to meet the income requirement of having received over \$600 of earned income during each of any 10 years before this year.

For more information, see instructions for Schedules R and RP.

Earned Income Credit.—A taxpayer who maintains a household for a child who is under age 19, or is a student, or is a disabled dependent, may be entitled to a special payment or credit of up to \$400. This is called the earned income credit. It may come as a refund check or be applied against any taxes owed. Generally, if a taxpayer reported earned income and had adjusted gross income (line 15c, Form 1040) of less than \$3,000, the taxpayer may be able to claim the credit.

Earned income means wages, salaries, tips, other employee compensation, and net earnings from self-employment (generally amount shown on Schedule SE (Form 1040) line 13). A married couple must file a joint return to be eligible for the credit. Certain married persons living apart with a dependent child may also be eligible to claim the credit.

For more information, see instructions for Form 1040 or 1040A.

AUCCOIN—AN OUTSTANDING YOUNG MAN

HON. JIM SANTINI

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. SANTINI. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to take this time to share with my colleagues the impressive attainment and

poignant achievement of one of our hearty band.

On January 16, 1977, in Las Vegas, Nev., I had the privilege of participating in the U.S. Jaycees' recognition of Congressman LES AU COIN as one of our Nation's 10 outstanding young men of 1976. LES' richly deserved attainment certainly enhances our collective public perceptions.

LES is in distinguished company as a TOYM Award recipient. This year's winners include Steve Garvey, an infield for the Los Angeles Dodgers; Wayne Newton, of Las Vegas entertainment fame; Dr. David W. Hartman, a blind physician; Harry Chapin, an entertainer; David Frederickson, a staff assistant to President Ford; Father William Atkinson, a Philadelphia priest; Frank Banks, a prominent black CPS; Dennis Landesman, a top archeologist; and Dr. Grady Stumbo, a rural health care specialist.

The principal ingredient sought in the selection of TOYM recipients is "selfless devotion to the betterment of mankind." Congressman AU COIN's past record of accomplishments certainly exemplifies this laudible yardstick. LES, at age 34, is the youngest major officeholder and one of the youngest Congressmen in Oregon's history. An award-winning journalist and an intuitive political leader, LES joins the elite ranks of past TOYM winners which include Nelson Rockefeller, Leonard Bernstein, John F. Kennedy, Bud Wilkinson, and Gerald Ford.

With this deserved recognition of our distinguished colleague, I would also like to share with you LES' penetrating and illuminating acceptance speech.

I include his remarks in today's RECORD:

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE LES AU COIN BEFORE THE UNITED STATES JAYCEES: "PRIDE IN POLITICS," JANUARY 15, 1977

I thank the Jaycees—and all who have contributed to this program—for this tremendous award. I particularly want to thank the Hillsboro, Oregon, Jaycees for nominating me.

Like the other honorees, in my short 34 years, I've received some recognition. But none means as much to me as this award you've given me this evening.

I say that because I'm a Congressman. Because I'm a politician.

I am proud to be both. But in a time when so many of us have begun to lose confidence in politics, in government—and maybe at times even in ourselves—it means very much to me that you've honored me, a political figure, at this particular time. The truth is, as it always has been: that politics can be what we—you and I—choose to make it.

And so I accept this award not only for myself—but for the hundreds of men and women of good and stout hearts whose good deeds in public office across the country do not always make the headlines, but who are determined to write a decent future for humankind.

Ladies and gentlemen, something happened three years ago that I feel I must share with you tonight. At that time you may remember that a young man stood before the Senate Watergate Committee and said something I regarded as one of the saddest chapters of that tragic episode.

He was asked, after being through all that he had been through, what his advice would be to young people thinking about a career in politics.

His advice was very blunt. He said, "Stay out."

It was then that I vowed to do everything I could as a person to overcome that advice for the sake of all of us. If I have joined other young men and women in succeeding in some small way, then I am pleased.

I have tremendous confidence in this remarkable land of yours and mine. Our generation faces incredible challenges. I'm sure each of us worries about those challenges and who among us tonight does not worry at times about America's resources in the face of those challenges.

But, my friends, there is no question that we can survive and that we can grow for the very simple reason that this land is rich in the greatest resource of all. I'm referring to Human resources. I'm talking about people.

And to accept an award sponsored by an organization of people such as the United States Jaycees will always be one of the proudest events of my life.

I thank you very much.

S. 474, THE EMERGENCY NATURAL GAS ACT OF 1977

HON. ANDREW MAGUIRE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 1, 1977

Mr. MAGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, in response to the current shortages of natural gas, the Congress has enacted the Emergency Natural Gas Act of 1977. It is not a bill of which we should be overly proud.

As the President readily admits, the legislation will not produce even 1 additional cubic foot of gas. Rather, it provides for a national allocation program to protect homeowners from supply interruptions and encourages emergency sales from intrastate sources—at high prices—to gas-short interstate pipelines and local distribution companies. But even as narrowly focused as the emergency program is, it still penalizes consumers of the interstate system while protecting the sacrosanct intrastate market.

Mr. Speaker, virtually every major interstate pipeline is disastrously curtailed. Schools, factories, and businesses are closing, leaving millions out of work. The allocation program promises to do little more than spread the misery of scarcity. If the cold weather continues, there simply will not be enough to go around even to protect homeowners. In New Jersey, instructions on how to close down homes are being printed in local newspapers.

Meanwhile, the "shared sacrifice" spirit of the Emergency Natural Gas Act does not extend to nonessential users of gas in the intrastate market. Producing State representatives argue that their States are entitled to exemption from allocation because they pay higher, unregulated prices. There is no doubt in my mind that the price disparity between the interstate and intrastate markets is the principal reason why more than 90 percent of new gas—other than that found on Federal lands—is dedicated to the intrastate market, contributing to

shortages elsewhere. The House tried to correct that disparity last year with the passage of the Smith amendment.

Unfortunately, deregulation advocates blocked that legislation, and threatened to do so with this emergency bill if they were not exempted. The administration, fearing blockage, refrained from asking for an extension of allocation authorities into the intrastate market.

The administration and the Commerce Committee in making that concession, did not see fit to apply the same logic to States whose consumers have for years paid high prices for the availability of synthetic gas supplies. Thus, my amendment to exempt the volumes of synthetic gas from an assessment of a State's supply situation was defeated.

Mr. Speaker, the Energy and Power Subcommittee will be holding hearings on the energy program that President Carter intends to submit in April. I am confident that the President recognizes the need to do away with the existing two-market structure, and at the same time protect consumers from OPEC pricing.

I know that the President shares the concern that all of us have with regard to reserves reporting and other energy-related data. The Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee has uncovered extensive evidence of underreporting and withheld production. In my judgment, too many price hikes have been rationalized with reasons of "incentive." No more must be granted until these vital information-gathering problems are resolved, and the Federal Government has access to reliable, accurate data upon which to base its policies.

Finally, the current natural gas crisis, which has wreaked havoc in spite of our initially large storage inventories, clearly demonstrates the need for tough, mandatory, and nationwide conservation measures. It has been estimated that over half of our current consumption of energy is wasted. It is well within our technical capabilities to develop conservation programs that will not reduce our standard of living, but will reduce our dependence on foreign energy supplies. Mr. Speaker, the current crisis demonstrates that we have no choice but to do so.

YOUTH APPRENTICE TAX CREDIT ACT OF 1977

HON. BARBER B. CONABLE, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, on January 26 I introduced H.R. 2404, the Youth Apprentice Tax Credit Act of 1977, to stimulate the hiring of teenagers and youth as apprentices in private industry. As apprentices, young people would have on-the-job training, experience, and skills development opportunities. Although they would initially receive modest apprenticeship stipends, as their experience and competencies accrued their

stipends would also increase. After the end of the first year, no stipend could be less than the current minimum wage.

An article appearing in today's Wall Street Journal explores the negative impact of the minimum wage on teenage employment opportunities and makes the point that many teenagers would not only accept job-learning situations at less than \$2.30 an hour but would be eager for such chances.

Next week the Ways and Means Committee will begin markup on the administration's tax stimulus program. I hope that my proposal to encourage the hiring of teenage and youth apprentices will be favorably considered and incorporated into this legislative package.

The article follows:

THE JOBLESS YOUNG: ARE TEENAGERS IDLED BY THE \$2.30 PAY FLOOR? SOME YOUTHS THINK SO

(By Alfred L. Malarre, Jr.)

Betty Jackson has a message for the people in Washington who want to raise the nation's minimum wage:

Drop dead.

If you suspect that Betty Jackson is a profit-greedy employer of unskilled workers who toll in some sweatshop for \$2.30 an hour—the minimum allowed by federal law—you are wrong. Plump, middle-aged, black, the mother of four ranging from 17 years of age down to 11, she employs no one. She is poor, and she herself is employed, at modest pay, as a social worker by Dade County, Fla. Her job is to try to find work for jobless teenagers in a poverty-ridden area just north of Miami.

"It would be just awful for the kids if they (the federal authorities) raise the minimum wage again," the black woman says. "It's bad enough now, but if the floor goes up again, the kids simply won't ever get hired."

A NEW ATTITUDE

A decade ago, people such as Betty Jackson, working closely with the poor and the unemployed, probably would have talked differently; the prospect of a sharply higher minimum wage would have been heartily welcomed. But no longer. Over the years, teen-age unemployment has mounted even faster than joblessness in general. And, increasingly, some people in the front line of the war against teen-age joblessness single out minimum-wage regulations as a major barrier.

Nevertheless, plans are afoot in both houses of Congress to raise the minimum wage to \$3 an hour and to provide automatic living-cost adjustments. The AFL-CIO regards such legislation as a top-priority need that should, the federation says, "benefit the entire economy by generating additional purchasing power and additional jobs." That view is strongly endorsed by F. Ray Marshall, President Carter's Labor Secretary.

Congressional proponents of a higher minimum wage, as well as many labor leaders, firmly oppose suggestions that any exemption be made for teen-age pay. "Teenagers would simply replace older workers if they were exempted," warns Clara F. Schloss, an AFL-CIO economist, taking a view that harks back to the days before child-labor laws were enacted. "Nothing is gained by pitting one age group against another."

And an aide to Rep. John H. Dent (D., Pa.), who plans shortly to introduce the \$3-an-hour proposal in the House, declares that "with such high adult unemployment as we have today, we certainly don't want to encourage a substitution of teen-agers for breadwinners."

SCARCITY OF STUDIES

Extensive, impartial studies of the causes of teen-age joblessness are surprisingly scarce, inconclusive and devoid of comment from teen-agers themselves. About seven years ago, the Labor Department issued a 189-page booklet titled "Youth Unemployment and Minimum Wages." The booklet stated that "increases in the level and coverage of the federal minimum wage may have contributed to the employment problems of teen-agers." However, it went on to caution that "it is difficult to disentangle such effects from numerous other influences," such as training programs and schooling.

The booklet didn't address the important question of whether teen-agers might grab jobs from adults. Besides, some observers suspect that it is adults—particularly the women surging into the labor force—who are grabbing unskilled, low-paying jobs from teen-agers. And the competition for entry-level work is rising at a time when an increasingly technological economy may be generating proportionately fewer such jobs.

Betty Jackson, of course, works entirely on teen-agers' problems and not on adult unemployment, which remains about 7% despite nearly two years of economic recovery in the U.S. Accordingly, she cringes at the prospect of a \$3 minimum that would include teen-agers. In fact, she is convinced that even the current \$2.30 wage floor has tended to increase the teen-age jobless rate, which stands at nearly 20% for all teen-agers and roughly twice that level for black youths.

SURVEYING THE TEEN-AGERS

Many teen-agers themselves share her views, according to a recent survey of more than 100 Dade County youths. Undertaken by the county consumer advocate's office, the survey sought to find out whether rising minimum wages do in fact contribute to teen-age joblessness. Today's \$2.30 minimum is up from \$1.60 as recently as 1971.

Teen-age unemployment is a severe problem in Dade County, an area with large black and Cuban-refugee populations. Some 40% of the youths interviewed said they were looking for work. The others either held jobs or didn't want one. Nearly half of those looking claimed that they would be willing to work for less than \$2.30 an hour. Office work and restaurant jobs were frequently cited as occupations in which minimum-wage rules tend to limit the hiring of youths.

A second, more-comprehensive study into the causes of teen-age unemployment in Dade County is being planned, with graduate students at the University of Miami volunteering to help county officials. But the recent survey leaves little doubt about the impact of minimum-wage rules.

Among the teen-agers surveyed is Maggie Jones, a 17-year-old black. Maggie, who recently gave birth to a boy, is unemployed but wants work. Guided by Dade County social workers, she recently applied for work at enterprises ranging from fast-food chains to department stores. However, she says, the answer that she gets is "always no, there's nothing available just now."

Would she work for less than \$2.30 an hour? "You bet I would, but there aren't many jobs like that around," she says.

Jimmy Harris, an 18-year-old black neighbor of Maggie's also wants a job. He had one last year, helping with inventories in a department store; it paid \$2.30 an hour, and he says he liked it. But he was laid off on Dec. 20, when the Christmas shopping rush began to subside. Like Maggie, Jimmy claims that he would gladly work for less than \$2.30 an hour. But "there's nothing around," he says, although he is a high school graduate.

Leonard Murray, a 17-year-old black, recently had job interviews at Miami branches at two fast-food chains, but he says, "I've had no luck." He had earned \$2.60 an hour

in a metalworking plant; however, he recently was laid off. "I would have been happy to work there the rest of my life," he says. "It was an eight-hour day, but I really had to work hard only three or four hours." He reckons that "there would be more work if there was no teen-age wage" for teen-agers.

Some of the teen-agers interviewed who do hold jobs are working for less than the \$2.30 minimum. In some instances, federal law apparently is being violated. No violation of state law is involved because Florida is one of 10 states with no minimum-wage statute of its own.

Deborah Evans, 17 and black, earns \$15 a week baby-sitting for a neighbor. The job, which is steady, entails about four hours of work a day, so that on an hourly basis she receives far less than the \$2.30 minimum. Neither Deborah nor her neighbor seem aware that a federal regulation is being violated. Although casual baby-sitting for a few hours a week isn't subject to minimum-wage rules, Labor Department officials say a job such as Deborah's, which involves more than 20 hours a week, clearly comes under the regulations.

WOULD JOB "DISAPPEAR"?

In any event, Deborah seems happy with the job. If she were to demand \$2.30 an hour, she says, the neighbor simply couldn't afford her services, the job would "disappear" and the neighbor would have to either give up her own job or leave young children alone in the house.

Various estimates indicate that roughly 10 million persons in a nonsupervisory labor force of more than 70 million remain uncovered by the federal law, although many of them are covered by state statutes. Some states' rules are stricter than federal law: Alaska's minimum is \$2.80 an hour, and New York's, though \$2.30, applies to a wider assortment of jobs than the federal minimum.

To try to enforce the federal minimum-wage regulations, the government employs about 1,000 so-called compliance officers. Complaints from workers also help. In a recent 12-month period, employers paid nearly \$71 million to some 447,000 workers who had been receiving less than federal law required. But no one knows how many violations of minimum-wage regulations go on.

Federal officials say enforcement is difficult and will grow even harder if the minimum is raised and coverage expanded again. Over the years, more and more job categories have been brought under the regulations; this year, for example, the law was extended to more than 500,000 workers in certain types of chain-store outlets.

CONCERNED BUSINESSMAN

Among Dade County establishments still exempt from minimum-wage regulations is John Manley's small, stand-up restaurant in a poor, black district in the southern part of Miami. Mr. Manley, a middle-aged black whose menu is limited to 18-inch hot dogs and buns, soft drinks and beer, is deeply distressed by teen-age unemployment in his neighborhood. "I would guess only about 10% of the kids around here have jobs," he says. He employs three teen-agers and pays each \$2.25 an hour. If the minimum wage were raised and extended to cover restaurants such as his, would he be able to keep all three? "No way," he says, adding, "If I had to pay them \$3 an hour, two would have to go."

Mr. Manley notes that several teen-agers who have worked for him have gone on to better jobs at the minimum wage or higher. One such teen-ager, he says, now holds a "very good job" as a cook in a downtown Miami restaurant.

Mr. Manley sharply criticizes the local school system, which, he says, produces some

"11th graders who can't even change a dollar bill" for a customer. He adds, "They learn more on the job here than at school." Many neighborhood teen-agers are heavily "into drugs," he says, and they wouldn't "work steady if I paid them \$5 an hour." He sees a clear connection linking teen-age unemployment, subsequent idleness, drug use and crime to support the drug habit.

A FATHER'S HELP

Among the few working teen-agers interviewed who gets more than the minimum wage is Jose Ortiz, whose family fled to the U.S. from Cuba in 1962. Jose works as a filing clerk at a Miami hospital. The youth has "no strong feelings one way or the other" about minimum-wage rules and frankly concedes that "I got the job because of my father," an administrator at the hospital. Unlike most teen-agers in the Dade County survey, Jose is from a relatively affluent family.

Moreover, most jobless teen-agers who say that they wouldn't work for less than the minimum wage also appear to belong to fairly well-off families. Gregg Greene, a white youth enrolled at a Miami high school, has "never had a job" but, he adds, "I never really needed one." He believes that if he does get one, he should rightfully earn "just as much as any adult."

Some proponents of a lower minimum for teen-agers note that most industrial nations have lower minimums, or none at all, for youths. Yet, it's said unemployment at all age levels in such countries generally is below corresponding U.S. jobless rates.

JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

HON. J. KENNETH ROBINSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the many friends and former colleagues of John O. Marsh, Jr., my predecessor as Representative for the Seventh Congressional District of Virginia, will find of interest the account of his plans to reenter the profession of law on completion of his present assignment with former President Ford's transition team which appeared in the Winchester, Va., Evening Star of January 28, 1977, so I include it at this time under leave to extend my remarks, as follows:

MARSH RETURNING TO LAW PRACTICE (By Lulu Williams)

John O. Marsh, Jr., who helped transfer executive power in the nation in two administrations, is returning to the practice of law.

Marsh announced yesterday that he is joining a Richmond law firm and is opening a Washington office with another attorney.

Until Feb. 14, however, he will continue to be a member of Gerald Ford's transition team, working out of the Ford transition office on Jackson Place.

He had worked in the White House with Jimmy Carter's transition chief, Jack Watson, Jr. in the transfer of power between Carter's election in November and his inauguration last week.

Marsh, who as the representative from the Seventh District had served in Congress with Ford, moved with him to the White House on Nov. 9, 1974, the day Richard Nixon resigned.

He was one of the four men tapped by

Ford to help him form an administration in those critical first days after he took office.

He was named again after Gerald Ford lost his bid for election in November.

At that time, Watson said he could "not have been more pleased with the grace and cooperation" he had received.

One of Ford's last acts as President was appointment of Marsh to become chairman of the newly-created President's Advisory Board on International Investment.

Marsh said yesterday he expected that board to meet "several times a year."

He will become a partner in the law firm of Mays, Valentine, Davenport and Moore, about Feb. 14.

He and another Washington attorney, Henry Dudley, will maintain offices at the Barr building at 910 17th St., Washington, D.C.

Dudley also will become a member of the Richmond law firm.

Marsh, who held the title of counselor to the President with cabinet rank, played a major role in many of the President's decisions, ranging from Ford's precedent-breaking testimony before Congress on the Nixon pardon, to the Ford-to-Carter transition.

Perhaps his toughest assignment in the intervening years was as head of the White House task force that coordinated President Ford's reorganization of the nation's intelligence community "including developing safeguards to preclude certain abuses that had brought them under public criticism," his announcement said.

Marsh was also selected to guide Nelson Rockefeller's vice presidential nomination through Congress. As an eight-year veteran of Congress, he worked closely with Congress during the Ford administration.

It was a long way from Strasburg in 1962 when he was tapped to be the Democratic candidate for Congress.

He won by a few hundred votes over Republican J. Kenneth Robinson and served four terms.

During that time, he served on the House Appropriations with then-Congressman Gerald Ford.

After deciding not to seek reelection in 1970, Marsh went back into law practice.

He was named assistant secretary of defense for legislative affairs in 1973 and joined the staff of Vice President Ford in 1974. He was Ford's national security adviser before moving into the White House in August of 1974.

Marsh received his law degree from Washington and Lee in 1952 and practiced law in Strasburg until his election to Congress.

A former paratrooper and World War II veteran, he is a retired lieutenant colonel in the Virginia National Guard and a frequent lecturer at Army command schools.

He and Mrs. Marsh live in Arlington with their three children.

NATURAL GAS: GOVERNMENT REGULATION OR MONOPOLY CONTROL

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1977

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, soon this House will have to vote on several important and controversial natural gas measures including permanent or temporary price deregulation, mandatory conservation policies, and the route for an Alaska natural gas pipeline.

Before these votes are cast, Congress owes it to the American people to de-

velop answers to several questions concerning the natural gas industry.

First and foremost we need to determine whether or not price deregulation would be tantamount to substituting private monopoly control of prices for governmental control of prices.

For example, if a few large natural gas producers and a few natural gas pipelines are powerful enough to control natural gas prices and supplies, then decontrol would be an unfortunate and terribly expensive mistake.

Maybe there is a middle ground between rigid price controls and total relaxation of such controls.

Second, I believe that Congress must act to develop independent data on the extent of the available domestic reserves of natural gas. Presently, the only data on reserves and usage come from the gas industry itself. This could be a dangerous example of the fox being in charge of the henhouse. A solid authoritative study and report by the Congress would go far to assure the American people that the energy sacrifice they may be asked to bear in the future are unavoidable and not the product of market manipulation.

Third, Congress must consider what effect the preliminary Federal Power Commission decision to approve the arctic gas proposal for a pipeline to transport Alaskan natural gas to the "Lower 48" will have on the natural gas picture.

If this preliminary decision becomes final, and the net effect of it is to foster greater market concentration in the energy industry, then a feasible alternative route must be explored.

For my colleague's information, I am extending here two recent articles on this subject by William Raspberry:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 7, 1977]

GAS SHORTAGE—OR RIPOFF?

(By William Raspberry)

The President has his emergency gas legislation, and we can hope that it will ease this bitterest of winters for some of the hardest-hit sections of the country.

But it won't solve the basic problem. It doesn't even define the basic problem. We still don't know, for instance, whether there is too little natural gas to go around, or only too little effort being made to get it to us.

We don't even know if the suffering of recent weeks is due primarily to the unforeseen harshness of the weather or, in major part, to the avarice of the people who control gas supplies.

The President, in last Wednesday's fireside chat, spoke to the point. "I realize that many of you have not believed that we have an energy problem," he said. "But this winter has made us all realize that we have to act."

But how we act will depend very much upon whether one believes that we were merely caught short or that we are being set up for another ripoff. You don't have to be a cynic to wonder.

Consider this recent statement by Paul E. Reichardt, chairman of the Washington Gas Light Company:

"The gas industry has reserves, proved and potential, to carry it well into the 21st century." The current crisis, he said, "is a shortage of readily available supply."

That answers one question and raises another: Why is there a shortage of readily available supply?

Rep. Clifford Allen (D-Tenn.), in arguing last week for putting all natural gas resources under presidential control, circulated ex-

cerpts from a radio interview with James C. Cotham, executive vice president of the Nashville Gas Company.

Said Cotham: "The producers are withholding gas from the market. There is absolutely no question about it. We have had members of our company in Houston, Dallas, New Orleans, off and on for the past couple of weeks, trying to find gas. And it is the strangest market I have ever seen."

"It is almost impossible to make contact with somebody who has gas to sell. You have to find a gas finder, or a gas broker, and this broker will make contact (and probably with somebody who will make further contact) and eventually you might find somebody who has gas to sell. You have no idea who it is or where it is."

Said Allen, who at age 65 is just beginning his first full term in the House after years of righteous battle against Nashville area utilities, "It sounds like dealing with a gang of illegal traffickers in dope and narcotics, rather than responsible businessmen."

That is precisely what it sound like, and it is hard to draw any other conclusion than that the producers are quite deliberately creating the scarcity in order to drive up the price of gas.

Remember how, after a few weeks of long lines and \$3 limits at the gasoline stations, we found ourselves unresistant to paying 70 cents a gallon and more? How many chilly offices, shutdown factories and threats of cold homes will it take before we are ready to accept a major increase in the price of natural gas? Is that what we are being set up for?

And is that what last week's emergency gas legislation encourages? An understanding was reached that the White House or energy czar James Schlesinger would establish a "threshold" price—pegged perhaps at recent intrastate prices—for gas not previously committed for interstate sale. Sales above that level would be subject to presidential review for "fairness and equity," but would not be subject to rollback.

Allen had argued for prior approval by the President for price increases rather than "a mere review" by him after the people have already been ripped off to the tune of millions of dollars.

He also argued, unsuccessfully, for presidential authority to compel the release, allocation and sale of all gas "now being withheld from the market by producers who have

contrived to manipulate and create this artificial shortage for their own selfish ends."

Allen may not have been able to persuade his colleagues in the House and Senate, but I am glad that there is at least one voice willing to say what so many of us believe: that the gas industry is "essentially a monopoly, controlled by a few rich, 19th century-type robber barons—a monopoly that has no viable competition and permits of no alternative to which the people can turn during these cold winter months."

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 9, 1977]

NATURAL GAS: A CHOICE BETWEEN A CURE AND A DISEASE

(By William Raspberry)

By now, there may be a national consensus that the two-tier price structure for natural gas doesn't make sense, and that it is an important reason for the current fuel crisis.

But a lot of us are afraid that the cure might be worse than the disease.

Gas sold in interstate commerce is subject to Federal Power Commission price controls. Gas sold within the state where it is produced is not subject to such controls. The producer who can sell intrastate at \$2 a thousand cubic feet isn't exactly leaping at the chance to sell interstate at, say, 52 cents.

Many of them are preferring simply to leave the stuff in the ground until the combination of closed schools, shutdown factories and galloping pneumonia persuades us of the wisdom of raising interstate rates.

"There's plenty of gas, and the pipelines are there," says Rep. Charles Wilson, whose East Texas district is in a gas-producing area.

"The gas is there, all right, but the drilling is going on only where it is economic to connect to intrastate pipelines. After all, the producers are in business to make money, and if the price structure won't let them make money . . .

The major companies, according to Wilson, are drilling offshore, where all the gas is for interstate sale. Onshore drilling is, for now, the province of the independent companies, and they aren't drilling where they can't tie into intrastate lines, he said.

Wilson gives an example of how some gas gets left in the ground. "Say you've got an oil field with proven reserves that is 200 miles from an intrastate line and 30 miles from an interstate line.

"Well, 200 miles is too far to run a line to hook up with the intrastate line, even though you can get \$2 a foot or better for

the gas. But the economics aren't there for the 30-mile line, either, because it's interstate and you are regulated at 52 cents a foot. So you leave it in the ground."

It's the only reasonable thing to do, the Texan insists. Residents of Texas, which along with Louisiana has as much gas in proven reserves as anywhere in the nation, has all the gas they can use. And it is consumer-financed by rates of between \$2 and \$2.25 a foot. To sell outside the state at one-fourth the intrastate price is to have Texans subsidize the rest of us, Wilson argues.

"If intrastate gas had been regulated at 52-cents a foot, Texas would be gas short, too," Wright says.

But how much of a solution is it to take the lid off interstate prices? Suppose the producers could sell as much as they cared to at, say, \$4 or \$5 a cubic foot. That would ensure enormous profits, all right, but it would also ensure enormous hardship. Too many people simply could not afford the price.

The obvious compromise solution would be a new price ceiling, higher than the present interstate rate but not high enough to pauperize families dependent on gas for cooking and heating.

Surprisingly, Wilson says he'd accept that sort of solution, adding, however, that "most of my constituents wouldn't, and most of the producers certainly wouldn't."

He believes that the present Federal Power Commission proposal of \$1.42 for interstate sales might make it economic to get the gas out of the ground. But that price is under litigation now, and the producers are sitting tight.

"If I were king," says Wilson, "I'd deregulate onshore gas immediately, and I'd gradually deregulate offshore gas, keeping all current contracts (most of them 20-year contracts) in effect. That would help avoid sudden jumps in price, as the new gas and the old gas merged.

"Then I'd reserve the right to veto any price that I considered to be too high."

He made clear that he would let the price rise high enough to force conservation since, after all, there isn't as much gas as there used to do.

The problem is that only the producers have any good idea of how much gas there still is, even in the proven reservoirs. The extent of the reserves constitutes a trade secret, they argue, and the FPC has no right to know.

SENATE—Thursday, February 10, 1977

(Legislative day of Tuesday, February 1, 1977)

The Senate met at 2 p.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Vice President.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, our God from whom cometh every good and perfect gift, bestow upon all who labor here the gifts of wisdom, patience, and charity. In the face of the needs of the world and despite our diversity, weld us together in a common purpose for the advancement of Thy kingdom.

May the words of our mouths and the meditations of our hearts be acceptable in Thy sight, O Lord our strength and our redeemer. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 7, 1977, be approved.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL 1 P.M. TOMORROW

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today it stand in recess until the hour of 1 p.m. tomorrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees may be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING AND URBAN AFFAIRS TO MEET ON FEBRUARY 23, 1977

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs may be authorized to meet for a markup session on the afternoon of February 23.